COPYRIGHT ARBITRATION ROYALTY PANEL

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

HEARING

In the Matter of:

Adjustment of the Rates for | Noncommercial Educational Broadcasting Compulsory License

Docket No. 96-6 CARP NCBRA

Library of Congress James Madison Building 101 Independence Avenue, S.E. Room LM414 Washington, D.C. 20540

Monday, March 30, 1998

The above-entitled matter came on for hearing, pursuant to notice, at 10:00 a.m.

BEFORE:

THE HONORABLE LEWIS HALL GRIFFITH, Chairperson THE HONORABLE EDWARD DREYFUS THE HONORABLE JEFFREY S. GULIN

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701



APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of Broadcast Music, Inc.:

JOHN FELLAS, ESQ.

NORMAN C. KLEINBERG, ESQ.

MICHAEL E. SALZMAN, ESQ.

of: Hughes, Hubbard & Reed, LLP

One Battery Park Plaza

New York, New York 10004-1482

(212) 837-6075 (JF)

6680 (NCK)

6833 (MES)

and

JOSEPH J. DiMONA, ESQ. (Asst. V.P.)

MARVIN L. BERENSON, ESQ.

Legal and Regulatory Affairs

BMI

320 West 57th Street

New York, New York 10019-3790

(212) 830-3847

On Behalf of ASCAP:

I. FRED KOENIGSBERG, ESQ.

PHILIP H. SCHAEFFER, ESQ.

J. CHRISTOPHER SHORE, ESQ.

SAMUEL MOSENKIS, ESQ.

of: White & Case, LLP

1155 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-2787

(212) 819-8740 (PHS)

8394 (JCS)

BEVERLY A. WILLETT, ESQ.

ASCAP Building

Sixth Floor

One Lincoln Plaza

New York, New York 10023

(212) 621-6289

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

APPEARANCES (continued):

On Behalf of ASCAP:

JOAN M. McGIVERN, ESQ.
Assistant Vice President of Legal
Affairs
Office of the CEO
ASCAP
One Lincoln Plaza
New York, New York 10023
(212) 621-6289

On Behalf of the Public Broadcasters:

R. BRUCE RICH, ESQ.
JONATHAN T. WEISS, ESQ.
MARK J. STEIN, ESQ.
TRACEY I. BATT, ESQ.
ELIZABETH FORMINARD, ESQ.
Weil, Gotshal & Manges, LLP
767 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10153-0119
(212) 310-8170 (RBR)
8885 (JTW)
8969 (MJS)

8405 (TIB)

and

of:

KATHLEEN COX, ESQ. (General Counsel)
ROBERT M. WINTERINGHAM, ESQ. (Staff Atty)
Corporation for Public Broadcasting
901 E Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2037
(202) 879-9701 (KC)
9707 (RMW)

and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

APPEARANCES (continued):

On Behalf of the Public Broadcasters:

GREGORY FERENBACH, ESQ.,

(Vice Pres. & Acting General Counsel)

ANN W. ZEDD, ESQ. (Asst. Gen. Counsel)

KAREN C. RINDNER, ESQ. (Asst. Gen.

Counsel)

PBS

1320 Braddock Place

Alexandria, Virginia 22314

(703) 739-5063 (GF)

NEAL A. JACKSON, ESQ.

DENISE B. LEARY, ESQ.

GREGORY A. LEWIS, ESQ.

Deputy General Counsel

National Public Radio

635 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20001

(202) 414-2000 (NPR)

2049 (DBL)

5170 (AWZ)

ALSO PRESENT:

GINA GIUFFREDA, CARP Specialist
TAMALA T. BOYD, Legal Assistant,
White and Case
ALBERT ALDERETE, Legal Assistant,
Weil, Gotshal & Manges, LLP

NEAL R. GROSS

I-N-D-E-X

<u>WITNESS</u> <u>DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS</u>

Peter Downey

By Mr. Rich 1958

By Mr. Schaeffer 2006

ASCAP			
<u>Exhibit No</u>	Description	<u>Mark</u>	<u>Recd</u>
-1 TZ	Characteristic	0010	0000
1X	<u>Current</u>	2010	2032
2X	Exhibit 516.14	2029	2049
3X	PBS Website printout	2049	2053
4X	Guidelines	2060	2062
5X	Electronic Media	2086	
6X	Web Pages	2097	
7X	713.55	2137	
8X	<u>Current</u>	2138	
9X	Article	2143	
10X	Article: Boston Herald	2157	
11X	<u>Current</u> 08-14-97	2166	
12X	PB Report 03-21-97	2170	
13X	Article	2175	
14X	PB 1997 Annual Report	2181	2184
15X	PBS Website	2185	2206
16X	Article	2191	
17X	Letter from PBS to Congress	2205	2206

NEAL R. GROSS

	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(10:08 a.m.)
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Ladies and
4	gentlemen, good morning. Let the record reflect
5	please, that the court reporter has been previously
6	sworn and remains under oath.
7	We apologize for being five minutes late.
8	We blame Metro, Amtrak. However, we'll stay five
9	minutes late to make up for it.
10	Mr. Rich, I believe we're ready, are we?
11	MR. RICH: We are, indeed.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: There are several
13	pending things we just want to bring to your attention
14	before we start. We have not yet received the written
15	withdrawal of the motion concerning the motion to
16	strike portions of Dr. Boyle's testimony.
17	And at some time we would like to hear
18	about the negotiation and progress you've been making
19	with respect to the Grajeda documents, and maybe it
20	was Iossa, some of those
21	MR. SCHAEFFER: No, just Grajeda.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Just Grajeda, okay.

1	And we understand that your response to the latest
2	request which has been filed by the Public
3	Broadcasters is due tomorrow.
4	MR. SCHAEFFER: That's correct.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: And we'll hear any
6	brief arguments if necessary, on that on Thursday
7	morning.
8	MR. SCHAEFFER: Very well.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right, with
10	that in mind then, Mr. Rich if you're ready to proceed
11	with the Public Broadcasters' direct case.
12	MR. RICH: We are. Thank you very much.
13	We would call as our first witness, Peter Downey.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. Good
15	morning. Mr. Downey, if you will raise your right
16	hand to be sworn please, sir?
17	WHEREUPON,
18	PETER DOWNEY
19	was called as a witness by Counsel for Public
20	Broadcasters and, having been first duly sworn,
21	assumed the witness stand, was examined and testified
22	as follows:

1	DIRECT EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. RICH:
3	Q Mr. Downey, would you please state your
4	name for the record?
5	A My name is M, as in Michael, Peter Downey.
6	Q By whom are you employed?
7	A Public Broadcasting Service.
8	Q What is your current position at PBS?
9	A Senior vice president of Business Affairs.
10	And that encompasses two or three different tasks.
11	One is negotiating production contracts with producers
12	from whom we acquire programming. A second is
13	supervising the administration of the PBS underwriting
14	guidelines.
15	Q How long have you held your current
16	position?
17	A Since approximately 14 years.
18	Q And prior to your current position, did
19	you have prior responsibilities at PBS?
20	A Yes.
21	Q Could you briefly describe those?
22	A Well, I joined PBS in 1977 and was brought

1	in to supervise the transition from terrestrial
2	distribution via AT&T to satellite distribution by
3	Westar satellite. And then gradually undertook
4	different tasks and responsibilities, and now am
5	responsible for those I outlined.
6	Essentially, in the larger concept it's
7	supervising what I'll call non-editorial policies at
8	PBS. The Programming Department takes care of the
9	editorial and my group takes are of the, sort of
10	business and other policies.
11	Q And prior to joining PBS in 1977, were you
12	previously employed in public broadcasting?
13	A Yes, from 1963 until 1977 I worked for
14	WGBH in Boston in a variety essentially a variety
15	of production tasks.
16	Q Could you very briefly, by way of
17	overview, Mr. Downey, summarize the main points you
18	came to establish in your written testimony, and then
19	we'll cover those a bit more fully?
20	A I think the main point I was trying to get
21	across in my testimony is that, certainly over the
22	last five years or so, the operations of the amount of

programming, the funds available to PBS, have all 1 2 remained essentially flat. We have not experienced 3 the kind of growth we did in the '70s, for example. 4 These have been in some respects, 5 difficult times, as I'm sure you may be aware. 6 only three years ago this time that the Speaker of the 7 House threatened to zero out public broadcasting, and so we are under continuing pressure just to try to 8 9 And we've succeeded at staying even but 10 that's the best we've been able to do 11 Do you draw any conclusions in your 12 testimony as to the degree to which significant 13 increases in music performing rights licensed payments 14 would be appropriate in the environment you describe? 15 Α It strikes me that there's a tremendous 16 disparity between what's been sought on behalf of the 17 ASCAP and BMI, and what's logical or rational given the kind of -- and level of activity that broadcasting 18 19 or public television certainly, has been engaged in 20 over these past five years. 21 There's just no -- I don't understand the 22 reason or the rationale or the logic behind the kind

1	of increase that's been recommended or proposed.
2	Q What is the overall mission of public
3	television?
4	A Essentially to serve the public. To use
5	the resources at our command to provide programs and
6	information that benefits the viewer.
7	Q Through what programming initiatives, in
8	your experience, does public television seek to
9	achieve this objective?
10	A This is, in some level or other, it's true
11	of every program we provide. But for example, one of
12	our major initiatives is in the area of children's
13	programming.
14	We have what's called a ready-to-learn
15	initiative, and present perhaps about a dozen
16	different, children's programs like Sesame Street
17	and Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood and Wishbone and Barney,
18	and a new series premiering this week called
19	Teletubbies all of which are intended to enable
20	children to learn basic learning skills and coping
21	skills.
22	And all of this is packaged in what's

called the ready-to-learn program which, through 1 outreach, through you know, services provided by local 2 3 stations in their communities, seeks through caregivers and through learning centers and what-have-4 5 you, to enrich or to extend the value of the programs through what's called mediated learning. 6 7 In other words, having an adult caregiver 8

In other words, having an adult caregiver work with the child to understand the lessons that are being taught. These are the kinds of services, the kinds of educational and social benefits that we try to provide through public television.

Q To what degree in your experience, is it the function of public television to replicate commercial television program offerings, as opposed to provide alternatives?

A There's -- I mean, they're, in my mind, completely different undertakings.

The purpose of commercial television is to gather in front of the screen the maximum number of viewers for the purpose of selling advertising. The purpose of public television lies in the program itself, rather than the number of people gathered to

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

view it.

1.0

While we're delighted when large numbers of people watch the programs we produce for mission reasons, our purpose, again, is not to reach large numbers of viewers or to compete on that playing field. The purpose instead is to ensure that the program itself provides the service or the information — the program itself is the end product, again, not however many people may watch it.

Q You have next to you an exhibit book reflecting the Public Broadcasting Exhibits. Your Honors has a set of also. Could I ask you to turn to tab 8 which is Exhibit PB-8, if you would? And flipping through those, could you describe for the panel illustratively, certain of the programming initiatives of PBS that reflect the mission that you have just testified to?

A Well, it's -- when people think of public television they often think of a short list of programs that they may watch from time to time. For example, the News Hour with Jim Lehrer, or Frontline, or NOVA.

But the truth of the matter is that there is an enormous number of activities that go on -- some of which are reflected on the television screen, some of which are not -- but all of which are part of the services that PBS and its stations provide.

In tab 8 you'll see, just from skipping through, we have an adult learning service, for example, which has enabled since its creation, some three million individuals to obtain college credit through televised credit courses in conjunction with their local public television station.

The Business Channel is a new undertaking of PBS -- and its objective ultimately, hasn't been achieved yet -- is to provide professional development, professional education to be delivered to the desktop using computer and Internet activities.

Now, this is something again, you won't see a TV program on your local, public television station, but this is an area where we can apply our expertise in education and telecommunications to provide an educational service to professionals.

Electronic field trips are another example

NEAL R. GROSS

1.8

1	of an activity where, by using a small crew and a
2	camera, we can take students on a field trip to a
3	place that is important to their particular studies
4	and relay that information, either by television or by
5	the Internet.
6	In the area of instructional television
7	many of our stations are actually owned by local,
8	public school systems and use the television
9	technology to deliver televised courses for students
10	from kindergarten through 12th grade.
11	Turning the page, here are some more
12	services for teachers.
13	Q I take it on the second page is the ready-
14	to-learn service you described a bit earlier?
15	A Yes. In the upper right-hand corner they
16	are, and under it, PBS video which is the means by
17	which we can make PBS programs available to the viewer
18	for their own pleasure in viewing after-the-fact, but
19	by the video.
20	Turning several pages to the page headed,
21	"Teacher Publications", there's a very extensive print
22	component of providing curriculum-based materials to

1	teachers in support of various subjects, in support of
2	public television programs, and again, making this
3	available nationwide.
4	Q Thank you. And turning briefly to tab 2
5	of these materials, PB Exhibit 2, is a list I take it,
6	of certain awards which PBS programming has garnered
7	in recent years, is that correct?
8	A That is correct.
9	Q Is there anything about the nature of the
10	programs cited there that you think illustrates the
11	unusual qualities of public television?
L2	A Well, I think that first of all, these
L3	are awards from organizations that we think of,
L4	anyway, are the most prestigious. And each of these
1.5	programs I think, is noteworthy for its quality, for
16	the quality of the content of the information it
L7	provides to the viewer; whether it be children's
L8	programs such as Sesame Street which is mentioned
19	so many times here to programs like Frontline and
20	National Geographic, and so on.
21	Q Let's talk a little bit about PBS itself.
22	What functions does PBS perform in the public

1	broadcasting system?
2	A Essentially, PBS is a program distributor.
3	PBS doesn't produce anything itself. It acquires
4	programs from independent producers, from its member
5	stations; organizes them into a program schedule; and
6	then distributes those programs out to the stations
7	via satellite.
8	Q And who are the member stations? Who do
9	they comprise?
10	A There are about 175 organizations or
11	entities who are licensed by the Federal
12	Communications Commission to operate one or more
13	television transmitters. In all, those 175 operate
14	about 350 TV transmitters. Each of those 175 is a
15	member of PBS. It pays an assessment annual
16	assessment to PBS for distribution services and also
17	provides to PBS funds with which PBS acquires those
18	programs.
19	Q Are there one or more non-commercial,
20	educational television stations which are not PBS
21	members?
22	A Yes, I believe there are about five

1	stations that are not PBS members but are non-
2	commercial, educational television licensees.
3	Q And do you have an understanding whether
4	those five, together with the PBS member stations,
5	comprise the entities for whom fees are being set in
6	this proceeding?
7	A My understanding is that all stations
8	eligible to receive funds from CPB are being
9	represented by PBS and CPB.
LO	Q And if you would look at PB Exhibit 1 in
11	the exhibit book, am I correct that listed there is a
12	group, at least as of the date of the commencement of
13	this proceeding, in or about October 1st of CPB-
14	eligible public television stations who are to be the
15	beneficiaries of the outcome of this proceeding?
16	A Yes. This is a list, as far as I can
L7	tell, of all of the stations eligible to be covered
18	here. There are large ones, small ones, state
L9	networks, major market stations, small rural stations.
20	They come in all shapes and sizes.
21	Q I think that answer more or less answers
22	what was to be my next question which is, there's been

	a for or restimony refrecting the economic
2	circumstances, programming circumstances, underwriting
3	circumstances of entities such as WNET and WGBH and
4	certain of the other very large stations.
5	Q How representative of the universe of
6	public television stations are those entities?
7	A Suggesting WNET is representative is like
8	suggesting New York City is a typical American town.
9	There are wide, wide variations. WNET's operating
LO	budget is somewhere in excess of \$100 million. But
L1	there are a dozen, or as many as 20 stations who have
L2	operating budgets of less than a million dollars,
L3	staffing levels of a dozen or 15.
L4	By-and-large, the great majority of
L5	stations are stations with budgets of less than \$10
16	million, fewer than 50 employees. By contrast WNET,
L7	WGBH, and one or two other major market stations,
L8	because of the significant role they play in
L9	television production, are in a class all by
20	themselves and are much larger because of that.
21	But again, they hardly represent the
- 1	

mainstream, or are they in any sense "typical" of the

1	average public television station.
2	Q What is the federal regulatory framework
3	in which the non-commercial, educational broadcast
4	television stations operate?
5	A They are all regulated by the Federal
6	Communications Commission. Non-commercial educational
7	television stations operate under a sort of separate
8	body of regulations. Some regulations apply uniformly
9	to all television stations, but there's quite a large
10	body of regulatory apparatus that applies only to non-
11	commercial, educational television because it's so
12	very different from commercial television.
13	Q And what would an example or two be of the
14	special areas of regulation?
15	A Well, of course fees the non-commercial
16	stations pay lesser fees, and there's for example, a
17	great deal of
18	MR. KLEINBERG: I'm sorry, I can't hear
19	the witness.
20	MR. RICH: Would you keep your voice up a
21	little bit?
22	THE WITNESS: Sure. I was saying one

difference is that there's a separate schedule of fees for non-commercial television stations, but I think -- and another area where there's quite a different body of regulation has to do with things like underwriting guidelines.

Public television -- well, all television stations are required to disclose who may have paid for a program, but there's a whole additional set of guidelines that apply to public television stations because in the course of announcing who may have paid for a program, this can arguably perhaps, lapse over into an advertisement, which would be impermissible.

And so there are guidelines or instructions from the FCC saying what you can and can't do on public television, so as to prevent a public television station from broadcasting an advertisement.

Q How do the economics -- this is a broad question but it's deliberately broad -- how do the economics of public television compare to that of commercial television to your knowledge and in your experience?

A Well, they're very different. The essential economic model that commercial television represents, as I said a moment ago, is to attract the largest number of viewers to the screen at any particular time, and then to in effect, sell those viewers off in lots of 1,000 to an advertiser.

So an advertiser pays a cost-per-thousand rate to have that advertiser's message exposed to this group of viewers. That is the sort of simple transaction, and that's where essentially, all the revenue comes from on the commercial side.

On the public television side there's just no counterpart to that. Instead, public television's struggle is to raise funds from a whole variety of different sources -- not through advertising but through grants from the Federal Government, from individual contributions, from viewers like yourself, from state government, from local government, from corporations -- either in the form of underwriting grants or, you know, straightforward charitable contributions.

There are manifold sources of revenue, and

NEAL R. GROSS

	because fire in public television is a constant
2	struggle in terms of raising funds, we have, you know,
3	attempted to plumb every possible line of support and
4	think of all different kinds of ways of raising funds.
5	So the sources of revenue are widespread
6	and numerous, but all essentially are in support of
7	the non-commercial mission of public television.
8	Q Do you have a copy of your written, direct
9	testimony in front of you?
10	A Yes.
11	Q If you would turn to page 11, please?
12	There are a series of pie charts there.
13	A Yes.
14	Q I take it those reflect the as of FY96
15	the diversity of funding sources that you just
16	testified to, is that correct?
L7	A Yes, this represents essentially, all the
18	sources of revenue for public television as gathered
19	by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. The
20	information was gathered by them.
21	Q Am I correct viewing this, that the
22	largest, single contributor of funding is at least

for these categories -- is membership at 23 percent? 1 2 Α Yes. The largest single-source is 3 membership, and membership incorporates a number of different sources of funding, but I think that what it 4 5 does include individual contributions are from 6 families and individuals in response to pledge nights, 7 for example, you know, a \$50 pledge in response to a 8 particular program. 9 It also includes things like planned 10 giving, where individuals are persuaded or encouraged 11 to make television -- put a public television station 12 in their will. It can be the gift of additional 13 contributions, or contributions to a capital campaign, 14 or contributions to an endowment fund. 15 distinguishing characteristic is that they 16 voluntary contributions from members of the public. 17 Q Do I understand you correctly to say that 18 pledge money is a component of this membership 19 category, but only one component of a number of giving channels? 20 21 Α That is correct.

the pie chart

also

Q

Now,

22

that

shows

1	business as a source, comprised in FY96, about 15
2	percent of total revenue, is that correct?
3	A That's correct.
4	Q Is all of that what we've been referring
5	to as underwriting money?
6	A No. It's a combination of, I would think,
7	three main subcomponents, or elements of that 15
8	percent. One would be underwriting for national
9	programs provided to producers and made part of, you
10	know, a national program distributed by PBS.
11	A second would be contributions from
12	corporations to local stations, which are acknowledged
13	by the local station on air, in that local market
14	only. And the third would be voluntary, charitable
15	contributions by corporations to public television
16	stations, which don't have an announcement on the air
17	attached to them. They're just contributions which go
18	to the general fund of the station.
19	Q And those three categories combined are
20	reflected in the 15 percent wedge of the pie?
21	A That is correct.
22	Q If you will turn two more pages into your

1	testimony.
2	JUDGE GULIN: Before we do that, could we
3	stay with the pie chart for just a moment?
4	MR. RICH: Sure.
5	JUDGE GULIN: Mr. Downey, these charts, I
6	assume they were taken from the FY96 report revenue
7	report? I believe we have that in the record. Do you
8	have access to that at PB-4 can he be given a copy
9	of that?
10	MR. RICH: Yes, he should.
11	THE WITNESS: Yes.
12	JUDGE GULIN: All right. If can turn to
13	look at the FY96 report. First of all, it says
14	"preliminary". Has there been a final report issued?
15	THE WITNESS: Well, this data is produced
16	by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, and I
17	don't honestly I don't know the answer to that. I
18	believe so, but I don't know for sure.
19	JUDGE GULIN: And if we take a look at the
20	pie chart that's on page 11, the last pie chart,
21	bottom right, where it's private, tax-based chart. I
22	assume if we take a look back at this FY96 report and

1	we look at the first six categories, beginning with
2	"CPB appropriation", and going down to "other public
3	college"?
4	THE WITNESS: Yes.
5	JUDGE GULIN: Is that what consists of the
6	tax-based
7	THE WITNESS: I believe that's
8	JUDGE GULIN: portion of that chart?
9	THE WITNESS: I believe that's correct,
10	yes.
11	JUDGE GULIN: Okay. And then the next
12	category, is from "private college" through "all
13	other" as far as you understand, would be the private
14	portion of that chart?
15	THE WITNESS: Yes.
16	JUDGE GULIN: Okay. Thank you.
17	BY MR. RICH:
18	Q Back to page 13, Mr. Downey, of your
19	testimony. Looking at these bar graphs, what does
20	this chart tell us about what has happened to the
21	percentage of total public television income
22	represented by corporate contributions over the past

1	five years?
2	A That's the second group
3	Q Yes, the second group there.
4	A called Business? Well, as you can see,
5	the total amount of support from business has declined
6	over the period.
7	Q As a percentage of
8	A As a percentage.
9	Q total money?
10	A Yes.
11	Q And overall, what conclusions if any,
12	would you draw from the depictions of each category of
13	contribution in terms of changes, if any, in the mix
14	of contributions over this 5-year period?
15	A Well, as you can see by this chart, some
16	are up, some are down. But you know, if you stand
17	back from it, in my opinion, the experience has beer
18	that total revenues are basically flat.
19	Q Just so the record is clear, both the pie
20	chart on page 11 and this chart on page 13 depict
21	system-wide public television income, correct? Not
22	merely PRS as a source?

1	A That is correct. CPB is obliged to
2	collect revenue information in keeping with the
3	appropriations regulations or laws, and does so and
4	has done so, for since its inception. It collect
5	revenue and expense information from every station,
6	every year.
7	So what you see here is the revenue
8	received by all public television and radio stations,
9	I believe no, this is television only all public
10	television stations during the years fiscal '92 to
11	'96 .
12	Q You testified a few questions back about
13	the ever-changing sources of revenue for the system
14	over time. What determines, in any given year, where
15	public television revenue comes from?
16	A Well, you know, we have limits at the
17	end of the day we have limited resources, and so one
18	of the things we try to do is to apply the resources
19	we have in areas which we think will be most
20	productive in revenue terms.
21	For example, in the 1970s a lot of energy
22	was invested in developing Federal support. In the

late '70s and into the '80s, sort of attention shifted -- you know, we sort of maximized and figured out how to do that, and shifted our resources more towards membership.

And some of you will not be pleased to hear that we tried to develop the whole concept of pledging and doing on-air fundraising -- which is of annoyance to some but it is the single, most costeffective, fundraising mechanism we have.

But in many ways we have exploited that to its limits by trying to do more pledging, which would simply annoy the audience, without concomitant increases in revenue, and so we've in a sense, sort of shifted our focus to developing relationships with media partners.

So that for example, we have relationship with the Disney company for the production of a series called "Bill Nye, The Science Guy". And it's a way of finding new sources of revenue to assist us in making programs available, but doing it with, frankly, with other people's money. And that is a way of enhancing, extending, broadening

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

	the service we provide, to benefit the public and the
2	viewers.
3	Q Are there other, new areas or new funding
4	approaches that PBS is either considering, or
5	experimenting with, or ruling out, in recent times?
6	A Well, another area that we've explored and
7	expanded our efforts is one is direct mail, another
8	is telemarketing, yet another is I mentioned a
9	moment ago planned giving.
10	MR. SCHAEFFER: I rise only to say I have
11	no problem with this, but none of this is in the
12	direct testimony.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Rich, do you
14	want to respond to it?
15	MR. RICH: This was my last question on
L6	this. I think it's covered in the broad range of
L7	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'm satisfied. We'll
18	cover this in some depth on cross.
L9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
20	MR. SCHAEFFER: As long as Mr. Rich has
21	raised it.
22	BY MR. RICH:

1	Q Did you complete your answer?
2	A I did.
3	Q Mr. Downey, is there a direct relationship
4	between public television to income stream and the
5	value of the music it uses?
6	A Not that I can see. We certainly use
7	music, but I think the reason, either individuals
8	contribute, or states contribute, or the Federal
9	Government contributes, are many and varied, and may
10	have some relation or may have no relation,
11	whatsoever, to the use of music.
12	For example, many state governments
13	contribute funds to the operation of a public
14	television system within that state in order to
15	support the distribution of educational or
16	instructional materials to schools. It really has
17	nothing to do even, with the content of the program;
18	it has to do with providing a distribution service.
19	As I mentioned before, there are some
20	stations licensed to local school boards.
21	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'm going to object. None
22	of this is in the direct.
	i de la companya de

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Rich?
2	MR. RICH: Your Honors, I believe this is
3	all in the direct testimony of the witness
4	MR. SCHAEFFER: No
5	MR. RICH: Looking at page what I think
6	he's 14, 15, and 16 yes, precisely; page 14.
7	The relationship of public television income to the
8	value of particular programming, let alone music's
9	contribution to it, is quite in direct. For example,
10	it goes on to talk about governmental exactly what
11	he's testifying to
12	MR. SCHAEFFER: No, he's talking
13	MR. RICH: I'm sorry, if I may. It's just
14	an example of governmental sources of income and
15	
	others that demonstrate the lack of relationship.
16	others that demonstrate the lack of relationship. It's directly tied to this paragraph on page 14.
16 17	
	It's directly tied to this paragraph on page 14.
17	It's directly tied to this paragraph on page 14. MR. SCHAEFFER: All that 14 I don't
17 18	It's directly tied to this paragraph on page 14. MR. SCHAEFFER: All that 14 I don't want to foreclose anything for the arbitrators and in
17 18 19	It's directly tied to this paragraph on page 14. MR. SCHAEFFER: All that 14 I don't want to foreclose anything for the arbitrators and in cross examination much of this may come up, but I must

1	government. It's not talking about mail order or any
2	of these other things he's talking about.
3	JUDGE GULIN: Well, he says public
4	television music simply plays no role in financing the
5	equation. I think the example following that
6	MR. SCHAEFFER: It says, for example, but
7	I'm willing to go on
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: He's testified that
9	PBS income is not dependent on the value of the music
10	used.
11	MR. RICH: Yes.
L2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Do you withdraw
13	your objection after
14	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'll withdraw my
15	objection.
L6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right, thank
L7	you.
18	MR. RICH: Thank you.
L9	BY MR. RICH:
20	Q Do you want to continue your answer, sir?
21	A Just to say again, that the reason
22	government institutions, colleges, universities,

1 school systems, corporations, member of the public contribute to public television, are as different as 2 3 the number of contributors. 4 There are some for whom music may be very 5 important. There are others for whom it's just not 6 relevant. So I would dispute or disagree that there's 7 any direct correlation across the board, between use 8 of music and our service. 9 System-wide -- that is, television system-10 wide, Mr. Downey -- what has happened to programming expenditures by public television stations over the 11 12 This is now reference to your past five years? 13 testimony at pages 17 and 18. 14 Essentially, spending on programming on Α 1.5 public television over the past five years has been flat, basically. You know, gone up a little and then 16 17 gone down a little, and then gone up a little, and then down a little. But again, if you stand away from 18 it, I think the only word that adequate describes it 19 20 is flat. 21 The same is true of PBS within that larger 22 sphere. but the amount we've been spending

1	programming has remained essentially flat, and has
2	actually gone down in some cases.
3	Q Focusing on the system-wide programming
4	expenditures, is there a process for gathering such
5	data, system-wide?
6	A Yes. As I mentioned before, the
7	Corporation for Public Broadcasting collects from
8	every station its certified, financial statements, and
9	then sums up from each of those statements, all of the
10	revenues and then calculates all of the expenses made
11	by all of the stations. And so we have a snapshot for
12	each fiscal year, of the amount of spending in several
13	expense categories, and all of the revenue data that
14	you see in my testimony.
15	Q To your knowledge, this activity is
16	conducted in the ordinary course of CPB's activities?
17	A Yes. In actual fact, the Federal
18	appropriation is a matching appropriation, which
19	matches contributions from all other sources. And so
20	there's a regular, legislative requirement in effect,
21	for CPB to calculate, to produce documentation of all
22	of the revenues of all of the public television

1	stations as part of the appropriation process.
2	Q Is there as well, an incentive for
3	stations to cooperate and accurately produce data in
4	response to CPS's request?
5	A There is indeed. As a condition of
6	receiving a television community service grant, which
7	is the name given to the Federal funds that flow from
8	CPB to the stations as a condition of receipt of
9	that grant, the station has to submit the financial
10	data that I've just described.
11	Q To your knowledge, were these system-wide,
12	programming expenditure data supplied to PBS and NPR's
13	expert economist in this proceeding, Dr. Jaffe?
14	A Yes, they were.
15	Q And do you know whether any adjustments
16	were made to that data by Dr. Jaffe?
17	A I believe Dr. Jaffe did make some
18	adjustments to that data, yes.
19	Q I take it though, as between you and Dr.
20	Jaffe, he would be the right person to explain the
21	nature and rationale for those adjustments?
22	A Please.

1	Q I take it you've adopted those system-wide
2	data with those adjustments for purposes of your
3	testimony, correct?
4	A That is correct. Yes.
5	Q And if you'd look at PB Exhibit 6, please,
6	am I correct that the television line these are
7	both radio and television programming and production
8	expenditure data but am I correct that the
9	television line reflects the system-wide data you've
10	just been testifying to?
11	A Yes, it does.
12	Q My colleague reminds me that this list is
13	pre-adjustment. I guess the legend at the top says,
14	unadjusted. I should have pointed that out to you and
15	to the panel.
16	A It does say unadjusted.
17	Q All right, and we'll then leave to Dr.
18	Jaffe and Appendix B of his testimony, the explanation
19	of the adjustments that were made to that data.
20	Now, am I correct that the data as
21	adjusted and as you testified to at page 17 of your
22	written, direct testimony, indicates total television

1	programming expenditures of \$648.8 million in FY92
2	versus \$675.7 million in FY96, is that correct?
3	A That is correct.
4	Q And you report that to be an increase of
5	about 4.1 percent over that period?
6	A Correct.
7	Q Now, you also testified a few moments ago
8	that PBS also keeps track of funding dollars spent on
9	PBS's programming as opposed to system-wide, is that
10	correct?
11	A That is true, yes.
12	Q What process brings about that data
13	collection?
14	A When a producer submits a program to PBS
15	for distribution, we require the producer to disclose
16	to us who may have paid for the program all of the
17	sources of funding that went into the production of
18	the program.
19	And then we keep track of that and then at
20	the end of the year are able to provide information as
21	to both the total amount or total value of the
22	programming distributed, as well as the sources of

1	those fundings; whether from corporations or
2	television producers or private individuals, or what-
3	have-you.
4	Q And if you would turn to the documents
5	appended to Exhibit 7, please? Can you tell me if the
6	document labeled, "Program Information Notebook" are
7	the documents prepared periodically which incorporate
8	the results of this data-gathering process?
9	A The Program Information Notebook is an
10	annual publication that summarizes the data to which
11	I have just referred.
12	Q And if you would turn to the very last
13	page of this compendium, which is labeled A-6,
14	relating to the report for FY 1995. Am I correct that
15	it depicts for a series of years, the funding of
16	original broadcast hours distributed by PBS, is that
17	correct?
18	A Yes.
19	Q And back to your testimony at page 18, at
20	the top, there is a reference to FY 1992 funding, PBS
21	funding, for original broadcast hours of \$300.9
22	million, is that correct?

1	A Yes.
2	Q And that's drawn from, and consistent
3	with, the entry at page A-6, is that correct?
4	A Well actually, at the bottom of 17 this
5	could have been clearer. The sentence reads, "PBS's
6	funding of original broadcast hours declined during
7	the period FY92 to '96, from 300.9 to 291".
8	We sometimes slip back and forth between
9	the use of PBS to describe the corporation in
10	Alexandria, Virginia, and PBS in its broader
11	application, to the entire public television system in
12	America. The figures 300.9 million to 291.6 million
13	over the period of '92 to '96, are applicable to the
L4	entirety public television.
15	The amount that passed PBS, the value of
1.6	the programming distributed by PBS during that same
L7	period, is a smaller number, because PBS's programming
18	is only a portion of all of the programming
L9	distributed nationwide.
20	Q Am I understanding your clarification to
21	be saying that the \$300.9 million in FY92 nevertheless
22	relates to the funding of original broadcast hours

1	distributed by PBS?
2	A Yes, it does.
3	Q Okay. Whether or not PBS was the source
4	of the funding itself or third parties may have been
5	the source of that funding?
6	A The value of the programming distributed
7	by PBS in other words, that passed through PBS in
8	fiscal '92 was \$300.9 million. And in '96, as you
9	see on page 18, was \$291.6 million.
10	Q Where does the FY96 number come from? I
11	see that the compendium here as Exhibit 7 only goes to
12	FY95.
13	A At the time we supplied these copies of
14	the Program Information Notebook the '96 number had
15	not been calculated, or was not ready. It has
16	subsequently that data has subsequently been
17	completed, you know, the summary reports.
18	Q That report was not yet finalized at that
19	time?
20	A At that time, that's correct.
21	MR. RICH: May I have one moment, please?
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.

BY MR. RICH:

Q Mr. Downey, what impact has this funding environment -- that is, the system-wide funding of programming at PBS and funding relating to PBS-distributed programming -- had in your own experience with PBS, had on PBS's own dealing with program producers? I'm sorry for garbling that question.

A Well, over the past five years as you see the big picture -- in other words, all of the money spent by system-wide on programming -- has remained essentially flat, and that's no less the case with respect to PBS.

And for example, over that 5-year period I can think of a couple of programs -- Great Performances, for example, which is essentially a weekly, cultural performance program -- the amount of funds flowing from PBS to that series over the period has declined by three percent over the five years.

The amount of funding we supplied to Wall Street Week has declined by almost ten percent over that same 5-year period. Some of our -- even some of our most popular programs -- and I'm thinking of

NEAL R. GROSS

1	American Experience, Mr. Rogers, NOVA, Washington Week
2	In Review the increase provided over the 5-year
3	period has been about two or two-and-a-half percent
4	for those programs.
5	And that's not per year; that's over five
6	years. So it's about half-a-percent per year. And
7	this again, by way of saying, we have not had the
8	resources to substantially increase anybody's funding
9	over the period.
10	Q In that environment, how appropriate would
11	it be in your estimation, for music copyright owners
12	to receive a significant increase?
13	A It wouldn't seem appropriate to me, if you
14	know, all the other things being flat or declining,
15	it's hard for me to understand what the basis would be
16	for a substantial increase to the music composers.
17	Q What percent of the total hours of
18	programming broadcast by all public television
19	stations did PBS distributed programming represent
20	over the last license term? And by that I mean the
21	period approximately 1993 through 1997.
1	

It hovers at around 60 percent.

Α

22

1	Q And approximately how many hours of
2	original programming does PBS distribute each year?
3	A That varies between 1600 to 1800 of
4	original programming per year.
5	Q And by how much has that varied over the
6	last 20-year period?
7	A Not very much. It in many respects, is
8	constrained by the number of prime-time program hours,
9	which is our essential duty to provide programs to
LO	stations. And so unless and until we can invent more
L1	prime-time hours, we're not likely to distribute more
L2	program hours.
L3	Q Let's talk finally, about what's been
L4	happening to public television's program mix. And
L5	here I would direct yours and the panel's attention to
L6	another part of this, appearing at page 21 of your
L7	written testimony.
L8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Rich, before
19	you do that, let me just ask Mr. Downey one question.
20	If you can go all the way back to Exhibit 6, please;
21	public television and public radio programming and
22	production expenditures.

1	You show under radio, 1992, 171 million,
2	and it continues to go up to 192, and then
3	significantly drops off in '96. Whereas television
4	programming and production expenditures go from 658 to
5	675 in '96.
6	Is there any significance to the fact that
7	radio dropped so dramatically?
8	THE WITNESS: There may be. My colleague,
9	Peter Jabelow, I believe will be testifying tomorrow
10	or the next day, and he I'm the television
11	representative and he's the radio rep, and I would
12	like to defer to him, if I may.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: I hope I don't
14	forget. I've written it down, anyhow.
15	MR. SCHAEFFER: I promise you I'll ask
16	him.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. Fine.
18	JUDGE GULIN: Let me ask you this, Mr.
19	Downey, about television. The revenues have been flat
20	since '92 you say. Do you have a figure, by the way?
21	THE WITNESS: Revenues for public
22	television?

1	JUDGE GULIN: Public television.
2	THE WITNESS: I believe that's in the
3	exhibits here.
4	JUDGE GULIN: Off the top of your head you
5	don't know what that
6	THE WITNESS: Not off the top of my head,
7	no.
8	JUDGE GULIN: All right. Programming
9	expenditures for television have increased 4.5
10	percent, was that your testimony?
11	THE WITNESS: Over the period, yes.
12	JUDGE GULIN: From '92 to '96. Now, when
13	the parties to this proceeding negotiated their
14	agreement in '92, those '92 figures were not available
15	to them, is that correct? Do you know?
16	THE WITNESS: I don't know. It takes a
17	good while after the fiscal year for the data to
18	become, you know, available.
19	JUDGE GULIN: So in all likelihood if they
20	were interested in these figures they would have been
21	looking at FY91 figures?
22	THE WITNESS: That's logical.

1	JUDGE GULIN: And I'll note that as far as
2	I can tell, there were no '91 revenue figures or
3	programming figures, I don't believe, for FY91 in the
4	record at this point. I believe we have '85, '90, '92
5	to '96. There's no '91.
6	MR. RICH: I believe, Judge Gulin, if you
7	look
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Unless I'm wrong.
9	MR. RICH: in the annual reports that
10	are appended as Exhibit 4 for example, look at FY92
11	you'll see comparative data from FY91
12	JUDGE GULIN: Percentage change, dollar
13	change? Is that what you're referring to?
14	MR. RICH: There's actually dollars
15	depicted and totals and percentages in the second and
16	third columns.
17	JUDGE GULIN: Ah, I see. Okay.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. Now Mr.
19	Rich, I forgot now, where you told us to turn.
20	JUDGE DREYFUS: Before we turn
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Sure.
22	JUDGE DREYFUS: one simple question

1	about the 1600 to 1800 hours. That's for 365 days a
2	year?
3	THE WITNESS: Yes.
4	JUDGE DREYFUS: So on the average, that's
5	somewhere between four and five hours a day, is that
6	correct?
7	THE WITNESS: Well, the service we provide
8	to stations consists of a children's block, and then
9	essentially from 7 Eastern to midnight Eastern; so
LO	about five hours a night.
L1	JUDGE DREYFUS: Okay, but I'm trying to
L2	relate that to the 60 percent. You said that 60
L3	percent was PBS-distributed.
L4	THE WITNESS: That is correct. If you
L5	watch the output of a local public television station,
L6	about 60 percent of its programs will be PBS-
L7	distributed programs.
L8	JUDGE DREYFUS: As represented by this
L9	1600 to 1800 hours?
20	THE WITNESS: No, because the generally
21	speaking, programs we acquire, we acquire rights for
22	a period of three years. And a station is free to use

1	it some multiple number of times over the three years.
2	JUDGE DREYFUS: Okay. I understand.
3	MR. RICH: Perhaps my question wasn't
4	clear enough, Judge Dreyfus. I was attempting to
5	elicit that figure for originally produced in any year
6	as opposed to distributed, which would include both
7	originally produced and re-broadcast.
8	JUDGE DREYFUS: Right. I understand.
9	MR. RICH: Thank you.
10	BY MR. RICH:
11	Q Do you have the chart on page 21 of your
12	written testimony in front of you, sir?
13	A Yes.
14	Q Can you tell me what, if any, trends in
15	terms of public television's program mix are reflected
16	in the chart and in your accompanying testimony?
17	A Well, the most noteworthy changes and
18	this is a bi-annual that's every two years study
19	that tries to take a snapshot of the mix of
20	programming available on public television stations.
21	And I think what's noteworthy is the
22	increase in news and public affairs programming over

+	the period, and the increase in children's programming
2	and a decrease in cultural programming. Otherwise,
3	the data are relatively stable.
4	Q And when you depict the increase in
5	children's programming am I correct that going down
6	the column entries you would be combining the
7	categories, general children and youth and Sesame
8	Street, for that purpose?
9	A Yes.
10	Q Now, you mentioned that these are the
11	product of bi-annual surveys. Who conducts those
12	surveys?
13	A The survey is commissioned by CPB, and for
14	years it's been conducted by a gentleman by the name
15	of Nat Katzman. And as I said, the idea is to take a
16	snapshot of the mix of programming available to the
17	public in these 2-year intervals. And it's, you know,
18	data that we've had to rely on for lo, these many
19	years.
20	Q And is the information depicted at PB
21	Exhibit 3 an example of the manner in which that
22	information is gathered and reported periodically?

1.	A Yes. The research notes for the period in
2	Exhibit 3 are based on the Katzman data that are
3	again, collected bi-annually.
4	Q Now, if we were to examine trends in the
5	program mix of PBS-originated programming let me
6	back up and ask this. The information depicted on
7	page 21 is again, system-wide; not limited to PBS-
8	distributed programming, is that correct?
9	A Yes. The Katzman data are a snapshot of
10	what all the stations are doing.
11	Q And let's now focus going forward three
12	pages in your written testimony, to page 24 on trends
13	in programming mix with respect to PBS-originated and
14	distributed programming. What trends do you identify
15	and how do they compare to the trends you just
16	testified to system-wide?
17	A Well, not surprisingly, the trends are
18	similar since two-thirds of what the stations
19	broadcast comes from us. And as you see, the
20	percentage of relative percentage of children's
21	programming has increased while cultural programming
22	has decreased.

1	And public affairs programming, again, has
2	increased while the others have remained relatively
3	stable.
4	Q And at the risk of being repetitive, how
5	are these particular data gathered?
6	A Again, every program that passes through
7	PBS, we weigh and measure in several regards: its
8	cost, who paid for it, and of course, what the subject
9	matter is and who appears in the program. And all of
10	this is gathered into a PBS program database from
11	which this information was derived.
12	Q Looking ahead over the next five years,
13	sir, what changes in public television's program mix
14	and funding environment along the lines you've
15	discussed, do you envision?
16	A I wish I could be more optimistic. I have
17	to assume that there will be relatively little change
18	over the coming years. There's no reason to suspect
19	major increases in funding from any of the sources
20	that we rely on, and I'm not aware of any plans to
21	make any substantial changes in the mix of program
22	subjects or you know, subject matter that we

1	distribute.
2	MR. RICH: Thank you. I have no further
3	questions.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
5	MR. SCHAEFFER: I wonder if we could take
6	a short break to set up because I think my cross is
7	going to take much of the day.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. Do you
9	want to
10	MR. SCHAEFFER: Whatever it will take to
11	get the documents set up. Ten minutes? Or five
12	minutes.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: How many witnesses
14	do we have scheduled for today, again?
15	MR. RICH: We're prepared to proceed with
16	Mr. Jabelow, although Mr. Schaeffer apparently, has a
17	rather extensive cross examination.
18	MR. SCHAEFFER: It is conceivable we will
19	not we will certainly finish Downey today; whether
20	we will finish Jabelow there are two crosses
21	MR. KLEINBERG: Not to be the proverbial
22	potted plant but I may, myself, have a few questions

1	for the witness.
2	MR. SCHAEFFER: It will be a very lengthy
3	day with Mr. Downey. So we hope to get - maybe we can
4	do Jabelow's direct today.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Do you Mr.
6	Schaeffer, do you or Mr. Kleinberg have any preference
7	as to which one cross examines first?
8	MR. SCHAEFFER: I think we agreed on, the
9	next two witnesses I would go first, and after that,
10	he would go first.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. How
12	much time do you need?
13	MR. SCHAEFFER: Ten minutes, Judge. I
14	just want my colleagues to set up their documents.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. Ten
16	minutes then, please.
17	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
18	the record at 11:04 a.m. and went back on
19	back on the record at 11:18 a.m.)
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. Mr.
21	Schaeffer, are you ready, sir?
22	MR. SCHAEFFER: Thank you. Yes, I am.

1	CROSS EXAMINATION
2	(On behalf of ASCAP)
3	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
4	Q Good morning, Mr. Downey.
5	A Good morning.
6	Q Forgive me for sitting but I can't read my
7	notes if I stand. I'd like to start out with a couple
8	of definitions.
9	It is true, is it not, that underwriters
10	in public broadcasting are third parties that have
11	voluntarily contributed cash or in-kind services to
12	finance in whole or in part, the production or
13	acquisition of a public television program?
14	That's the definition, is it not?
15	A Yes.
16	Q And carriage, the word carriage means
17	in public broadcasting parlance, or in broadcasting
18	parlance means the actual showing or broadcasting
19	of a program, isn't that correct?
20	A Yes.
21	Q And common carriage, does it not, mean the
22	carrying of broadcasts on a number of different

1	stations at more or less the same time, isn't that
2	correct?
3	A Yes.
4	Q And a producer in the broadcasting field -
5	- both public and commercial would be somebody who
6	creates programming, wouldn't it?
7	A Yes.
8	Q Similarly, in the public broadcasting
9	parlance, producing stations are those broadcasting
10	stations in the public system that produce programs
11	that are broadcast by themselves and others and in the
12	system, isn't that correct?
13	A That is a phrase commonly used to refer to
14	those stations who supply a great deal of programming
15	to people.
16	Q And it is also true that both the
17	producing stations and the producers in public
1.8	broadcasting, seek as much common carriage as possible
19	in the distribution of their programs, isn't that
20	true?
21	A Depends on the program. There are some
22	programs distributed by PBS, essentially during prime-

1	time hours, where producers are very anxious to have
2	their programs be designated as common carriage
3	programs.
4	There are other programs I'm thinking
5	of children's programs, for example where the
6	producer is just not relevant.
7	Q Let's keep our attention on the former
8	rather than the latter. There are then, a number of
9	programs that the producers are very, very concerned
10	should be carried on at the same time by the stations,
11	isn't that correct?
12	A Yes.
13	Q And the reason for that, is it not, is
14	because the underwriters as I have defined them, are
15	very anxious that the programs be shown in prime-time,
16	isn't that correct?
17	A I think you can't make so broad a
18	generalization. There are many different kinds of
19	underwriters. Foundations, for example, or the
20	Federal Government itself, who may be indifferent as
21	to when the program is shown.
22	Q With respect to corporate underwriters

<u>.</u>	Modil, Texaco, the like those underwriters isn't
2	it a fact that they are very, very concerned that the
3	programs they underwrite be broadcast in prime-time?
4	A That is not a universal
5	Q All right.
6	MR. RICH: Can he finish he answer,
7	please?
8	MR. SCHAEFFER: Sure.
9	THE WITNESS: Different corporations
10	underwrite for different reasons. Ah
11	MR. SCHAEFFER: Would you
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Go ahead. Are you
13	finished?
14	THE WITNESS: Yes.
15	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'd like to put before the
16	witness an exhibit that we've designated as 505.69.
17	Give it to the arbitrators first and then just put it
18	in front of the witness.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Schaeffer, so
20	you want this marked for identification?
21	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes, I do. I'm going to
22	ask some questions about it.

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. What's
2	the number on this?
3	MR. SCHAEFFER: This would be our first
4	cross examination exhibit.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Right. All right,
6	ASCAP Exhibit 1X.
7	MR. SCHAEFFER: Thank you.
8	JUDGE GULIN: Is this already in?
9	MR. SCHAEFFER: Well, it's one of the
10	Grajeda exhibits. All right. Some of them will be
11	common. We'll eventually have to have a concordance.
12	(Whereupon, the above-referred
13	to document was marked as ASCAP
14	Exhibit No. 1X for
15	identification.)
16	MR. SCHAEFFER: Why don't you take an
17	opportunity if you would, Mr. Downey, just to read
18	ASCAP 1X to yourself? And let me know when you're
19	finished, Mr. Downey.
20	JUDGE DREYFUS: Is there a date?
21	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes, it's on the lower,
22	right-hand corner. It's November 20th, 1995. All of

1	those have on the right-hand corner, a date.
2	Thank you, Mr. Downey. May I continue?
3	THE WITNESS: Please.
4	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
5	Q Are you familiar with a periodical known
6	as <u>Current</u> ?
7	A Yes.
8	Q What is <u>Current</u> ?
9	A It's a publication of trade publication
10	within the public television family.
1.1	Q Public broadcasting isn't it? It covers
12	radio as well?
13	A Yes, you're correct.
14	Q And it appears bi-weekly?
15	A I believe that's correct.
16	Q Do you have an understanding as to who
1.7	owns <u>Current</u> ?
18	A I believe it's owned by a consortium of
19	public television stations.
20	Q I think public broadcasting stations, but
21	
22	A Broadcasting stations.

1	Q I think for our purposes it's the same
2	difference. Do you read <u>Current</u> frequently?
3	A Yes.
4	Q You note your name appears in <u>Current</u> on
5	the first and third columns of this particular
6	article, do you not?
7	A I see I'm in the third column.
8	Q Okay. And you're also, I think you'll
9	find, in the first column on the second page.
10	A Oh, I'm sorry.
11	Q That's you, isn't it?
12	A That is me.
13	Q Let me just ask you, have you ever read
14	this article before?
15	A I think so.
16	Q Now, the first line of this article says,
17	common carriage has been debated to death, and into
18	the afterlife by public TV stations. Is that somewhat
19	colorful statement true, in your opinion?
20	A It has certainly been debated at great
21	length over many years.
22	Q And then would you just drop down to

1.	and forgive me because my eyes aren't good so I'm
2	going to have to take my glasses off at the bottom
3	of the first column there's a quotation attributed to
4	a Lance Ozier, the director of Marketing for WGBH. Do
5	you know him?
6	A I do.
7	Q And would you agree with Mr. Ozier's
8	characterization that the origins of this policy are
9	in the need to be able to reassure underwriters that
LO	the show they're underwriting and the credits and the
11	off-the-air activities, will happen on a certain date
L2	and time? Or would you disagree with Mr. Ozier?
L3	A That's Mr. Ozier's opinion. There are
L4	other reasons for the common carriage policy.
L5	Q Well, then you disagree with Mr. Ozier?
L6	A That I don't disagree with him. That's
L7	his opinion.
L8	Q Well, is this, in your opinion, is this an
L9	origin of the policy of common carriage?
20	A It is one of several origins.
21	Q I won't bother asking you to quantify
22	that. Would you then go through well, let's try
- 1	1

1	this, then. The second column says, Mobil and Aetna,
2	which at one time provided full or sole corporate
3	support for Masterpiece Theater, Mystery and American
4	Experience became "fed up" by variance in stations
5	broadcast schedules across the country, Ozier added.
6	Do you agree with that statement?
7	A I can't I have no knowledge of, you
8	know, whether that's true or not.
9	Q You were not involved in your capacity as
10	head of programming at PBS as to whether or not that
11	was a reason for Aetna and Mobil discontinuing their
12	support?
13	A Let's be clear. I'm not head of
14	programming at PBS.
15	Q I see. Who at PBS, would know that?
16	A As to
17	Q Whether Ozier's comment is true?
18	A I don't know.
19	Q Incidently, Ozier's station was the
20	producing station for those shows, wasn't it?
21	A It's the presenting station. It doesn't
22	produce the programs; it acquires them from third

1	parties and presents them on PBS.
2	Q So, so-to-speak, they are WGBH was the
3	station, the entity in the system more directly
4	associated with the marketing of those shows
5	A That is correct.
6	Q that would be a fair comment? Okay.
7	Then the article goes on in the second column from
8	which I'm reading, saying Mobil also abandoned its
9	efforts to promote Masterpiece Theater and Mystery
LO	with national ads, because stations ran the programs
11	at different days and times, Ozier said.
12	"The crazy quilt of broadcast schedules
13	made it just impossible to promote with national ads."
14	Carriage is inconsistent, even among stations in the
15	top-10 or 20 markets.
16	You don't agree or disagree, or do you
17	agree with Ozier's comment there?
18	A I agree that programs from time to time,
19	are carried by stations at very different times, and
20	that that can be disadvantageous if our objective, for
21	example, is to ensure that the program is seen by as
22	the largest audience we can assemble for it.

Q Has it ever been communicated to you that some of the major underwriters as I have defined the term, are dissatisfied if their shows don't appear in prime-time, or appear at different hours throughout the system? Hasn't that been said to you?

A There's certainly anecdotal evidence of underwriter disappointment that their programs may not

Q And that dissatisfaction has been expressed on a number of occasions by what I would describe and I think you would describe, as major underwriters, isn't that true?

have been carried uniformly throughout the system by

A It's hard to quantify that or to put it in some context. If that were universally true of every underwriter all the time, then either there wouldn't be underwriters or everybody would commonly carry all programs all the time. What you see is that this continues to be a debate which is evidence to indicate that it's not a universal complaint or dissatisfaction of every underwriter. Again, it varies from case-to-case.

1.6

all stations.

1	Q Not a matter of concern to you, I assume?
2	In the system? Common carriage is for you, not a
3	problem in the system?
4	A I happen to believe in the value of it and
5	the importance of it, as do we have instituted a
6	new common carriage policy. It's not the first time
7	we've done this but it's been in operation now for
8	about two years. And at this occasion it's been
9	successful. Stations are observing it.
10	Q Now let's go on though maybe I'll get
11	back to your answer but let's just go on with this
12	article. By the way, do you know Karen Everhart
13	Bedford?
14	A I do.
15	Q Who is she?
16	A She is a reporter for <u>Current</u> magazine.
17	Q Reasonably well regarded by you?
18	A Yes.
19	Q Now, this goes on and I think this is -
20	- not a quote from Ozier so I'm just asking your
21	reaction; whether you think this is accurate or not.
22	Within the last decade corporate sponsors

1 have begun seeking additional marketing tie ins that 2 "will help their business, he continued". I guess it is Ozier. Underwriters don't just want 3 credits; they want them to "coincide with other things 4 they're doing". 5 Isn't that a true statement? 6 7 Α There has been a change in -- the reasons 8 process by which corporations come to 9 underwrite programs over the past ten years or so. the 1980s typically, underwriting funds came from 10 11 corporate communication's budgets. Corporations wishing to perform charitable acts or simply be 12 associated with quality. 13 14 During the more recent times corporations have -15 - the budgets from which program underwriting comes have tended to be in the marketing and advertising 16 17 budgets, which are much more -- typically much more 18 closely tied to bottom-line consideration. That is a fact. 19 20 So that you do agree with Mr. Ozier's 21 statement which I just read?

There are some --

Α

22

1	Q Yes or no?
2	A some underwriters for whom who want
3	well, some underwriters the reason they're doing
4	it, again, is to associate with quality, to associate
5	themselves with the fine program presented to the
6	public, and they want to gain benefit from that
7	association.
8	And so will undertake to, not simply
9	underwrite the program, but perhaps put stories in
10	their employee newsletters or have other public events
11	associated with the program. And so there's a yes,
12	there's a more coordinated, more broad-based effort to
13	associate themselves with the program.
14	Q And they sometimes want to put it in
15	periodicals of general interest, don't they? Not just
16	employee newsletters?
17	A I'm sorry, put what in?
18	Q Companies like Mobil and Aetna want to
19	have a coincidence of the shows with print advertising
20	in the general media, don't they?
21	A Some of our underwriters do take out print
22	you know, print ads supporting their own

1	investment, yes.
2	Q And it's important to them at least
3	those underwriters, whomever they may be that there
4	be common carriage, isn't that correct?
5	A Again, it depends on the underwriter.
6	Some are interested in achieving whatever achieving
7	maximum impact, however they define that. Others are
8	less interested or concerned about that.
9	Q Now, the story goes on to quote you. It
10	says maybe you want to follow on because I'm going
11	to ask you if you think it was accurate with 200
12	different station programmers within the system,
13	"there is always going to be difference in the way
14	they prefer to schedule their stations", said Peter
15	Downey, PBS senior VP of Program Business Affairs.
16	"It's not as if there's a short of list of
17	people who consistently or persistently do this. It's
18	more of a random occurrence." Was that your
19	sentiments at the time?
20	A I think this is probably accurate, yes.
21	Q All right. Then you go on to say, "What's
22	really important to producers is the promise of

1	performance, as well as the performance itself",
2	Downey added. "Sooner or later an underwriter says,
3	'do all stations carry the programs at the same time?'
4	For many years producers have had to say, well, we
5	can't guarantee that."
6	Is that a substantially accurate quote
7	from you on this occasion?
8	A Yes, in this context.
9	Q Now, it then goes on to say, PBS's
10	proposed carriage rules which were revised this summer
11	after stations balked at the use of fines to enforce
12	compliance, call for stations that buy the full,
13	national program service to carry 300 of the 350
14	programming hours designated for common carriage. I
15	take it that was a true statement, certainly in 1995?
16	A Yes.
17	Q Now, what were the proposed carriage rules
18	before they were revised?
19	A I'm trying to recall.
20	Q Did they involve a fine as suggested here?
21	A They did not.
22	Q Well, why don't you tell us, as best you

can recall

A As best I can recall, the last common carriage -- well, back in the early '80s there was a plan whereby stations were expected but certainly not required to carry two hours a night Sunday through Wednesday. So 8 to 10, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday.

But then there's that of -- then we got away from that sort of formal designation and more to an informal, program-by-program, title-by-title designation. And then what this article is referring to is a more formal approach measured by program hours over the course of a year rather than particular time slots on particular evenings.

- Q This emanated from PBS, I take it?
- A In collaboration with its stations.
- Q And Ms. Bedford apparently, was under the apprehension -- or perhaps a misapprehension -- that the proposed rule was using fines to enforce compliance. That's just wrong, is that correct?

MR. RICH: Objection to the form. It's asking what's in some reporter's head.

NEALR. GROSS

1	MR. SCHAEFFER: No, I'm asking well,
2	let me put it a different way.
3	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
4	Q Is it your understanding that a claim,
5	that the originally proposed carriage rules contained
6	fines on stations that didn't comply with the common
7	carriage rules? Whether that is wrong?
8	A Well, let me state that there's an
9	affirmative fact. We have a common carriage policy
10	administered by the PBS Board of Directors, and if a
11	station is out of compliance with that policy the
12	station is exposed potentially, to a monetary fine.
13	Q And what is the nature of that fine, Mr.
14	Downey?
L5	A That's up to the Board.
16	Q I see. Has anybody ever been fined?
L7	A No.
18	Q And how long has that penalty been in
19	existence?
20	A We are now midway into the third year of
21	this present iteration of a common carriage policy.
22	Q So it started around 1995?

1	A Yes, about the time this article
2	Q About the same time as this article?
3	Okay. Then let's see if I can skip some of this.
4	Well, the article goes on to say in the first column
5	of the second page, "A peer review group will keep an
6	eye on carriage levels and deal with stations who fail
7	to meet the minimum 300 hours. If a station has a
8	'reasonable local problem, that prevents it from
9	meeting this goal such as local news events, special
10	fundraisers, or legislative coverage, the peer review
11	group can grant a waiver of a policy', said Bob
12	Ottenhoff" I hope I said that right "PBS
13	executive VP".
14	Was Ottenhoff a PBS executive VP at the
15	time?
16	A He was.
17	Q And what was the nature of this peer
18	review group that reviewed the local stations for
19	compliance with the carriage rules?
20	MR. RICH: I'm going to interpose an
21	objection at this point. This is totally unrelated to
22	any subject of direct examination. Common carriage,

1	peer group assessments. I can understand now why Mr.
2	Schaeffer anticipates a full day of cross. He's
3	apparently going to go through everything in the
4	history of the Public Broadcast Service. But this
5	witness' testimony didn't cover this ground at all.
6	MR. SCHAEFFER: This witness has testified
7	has testified in his direct, written testimony,
8	that while revenues in the commercial broadcasting
9	sphere are derived from advertising sales tied to
10	program viewership, the financing of public
11	broadcasting operates on entirely different
12	principles. He also said the relationship of public
13	television to the value of particular programming, let
14	alone music's contribution to it, is quite indirect.
15	I think I am establishing that the same
16	considerations for prime-time viewing are applicable
17	to the public broadcasting system, and that's
18	inconsistent with what this witness has said.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
20	MR. SCHAEFFER: Thank you.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Overruled.
22	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:

1	Q What is this peer review group that was
2	keeping policing the common carriage rules?
3	A Since that time the peer review group has
4	become what's called the Membership Committee of the
5	PBS Board, made up of PBS Board members.
6	Q Those PBS Board members are typically from
7	the producing stations, are they not?
8	A No.
9	Q Who are they, at the present time?
10	A There are 35 members of the PBS Board;
11	about evenly divided between professionals meaning
12	persons in the employ of PBS stations and the other
13	half are what we call lay directors persons who are
14	voluntarily associated with stations as members of
15	local Boards of Directors. And there are some, so-
16	called general directors who are appointed by the lay
17	and professional directors.
18	Q And who's on the peer review group at the
19	present time?
20	A The membership committee is predominantly
21	professional members of the Board. There are about
22	I think there are ten members, one of whom is no,

1	there are no members of none of the major producing
2	stations is presently represented on that committee,
3	to the best of my recollection.
4	Q Would you consider that a conflict of
5	interest? If they were on?
6	A There are many conflicts inherent in the
7	relationship of PBS and its member stations. And we
8	try to be mindful of that and people recuse themselves
9	when it's appropriate to do so.
10	Q Let's move on. The article goes on to
11	say, otherwise, a non-complying station would be
12	subject to a reign of sanctions which include sending
13	a letter to the station's licensee board, withdrawing
14	program rights, to fining the station 20 percent of
15	its program dues.
16	Was that ever the sanctions that were
17	available against a station that was not complying
18	with the common carriage rules?
19	A Those are the range of sanctions available
20	to the membership committee which now administers or
21	monitors this policy.
22	Q What are program dues?

1	A Each PBS member station is assessed an
2	annual program assessment, which are the funds PBS
3	uses to acquire programs. That's its program dues.
4	Q I see. And one of the penalties possible
5	if you don't obey the common carriage rules, would be
6	to charge an additional 20 percent, is that correct?
7	A I think that was imagined as the outer
8	limit of what's possible.
9	Q Well, it would be punitive, I assume?
10	A That's correct.
11	Q Then the article goes on to say, the
12	proposed carriage rules yet to be formally approved by
13	the PBS Board, call for cooperation among all stations
14	in meeting two performance goals for dedicated
15	programs, carriage by 90 percent of the stations on
16	the same night and coverage of 90 percent of TV
17	households.
18	Is that the current rule?
19	A That is it's not a rule; that's an
20	objective, a goal.
21	Q Well, let's just move on to let's see
22	if I can just I can finish with this.
- 1	

1	MR. SCHAEFFER: Excuse me. I'm next going
2	to ask that a document, Exhibit 516.14 of the original
3	Grajeda group, now be marked as ASCAP 2 for cross
4	examination.
5	JUDGE GULIN: Number 2X.
6	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes, 2X.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: It will be marked
8	for identification ASCAP Exhibit 2X.
9	(Whereupon, the above-referred
10	to document was marked as ASCAP
11	Exhibit No. 2X for
L2	identification.)
L3	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'd ask you to read that.
L4	I have several questions about this, Mr. Downey. Let
L5	me know when you've concluded, and if the Chair will
L6	let me know when I can proceed.
L7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Schaeffer, let
18	me just inquire while the witness is reading that, do
L9	you intend to move these individually or collectively
20	
21	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes, I thought I would do
22	it whichever I move the previous exhibit be put

1	into evidence.
2	MR. RICH: We object, Your Honor.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. On what
4	basis?
5	MR. RICH: That with the exception of
6	statement attributed to Mr. Downey, they contain
7	hearsay, and at least in one case, examined on double-
8	hearsay; comments attributed to Mobil and Aetna as
9	reported by a Mr. Ozier. The witness testified that
10	he didn't adopt or necessarily agree with the
11	sentiments beyond the fact that they were sentiments
12	of X or Y.
13	So certainly to the extent a newspaper
14	article or a periodical piece purports to come in for
15	the truth of the statements which Mr. Schaeffer
16	attempted to get this witness to adopt and for the
17	most part, this witness did not adopt, at least as to
18	a view that's binding on PBS in this proceeding, I
19	think the document is objectionable.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
21	MR. SCHAEFFER: One, even if there was a
22	hearsay objection they're obviated in arbitration.

1	Two, the witness has affirmed the substantial truth of
2	the document, and if they don't think it's true
3	they'll have plenty of time to controvert it. I think
4	he's pretty well ratified most of it, and I don't
·5	think what has been said before is a valid objection,
6	even in a court of law.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Do you have
8	anything?
9	JUDGE DREYFUS: Yes. Is the document
10	being offered for its probative value or are you
11	simply using it as a mechanism to do a cross
12	examination and have the witness' testimony be the
13	evidence?
14	MR. SCHAEFFER: Both. I don't think
15	hearsay is an objection. I've never heard it being an
16	objection in arbitration, and I'd have to say I would
17	be I don't know why CARP would be any different
18	than any other newspaper articles are regularly
19	used in arbitration. I believe, but that's my view,
20	and therefore I would offer it for both.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: I once sustained an
22	objection Mr. Schaeffer, describing it as rank

hearsay, and someone asked me to define that. 1 2 bit like cheese, or something, it was so far out. 3 The objection is overruled. 4 (Whereupon, the above-referred 5 to document previously marked 6 as ASCAP Exhibit No. 1X was 7 received in evidence.) BY MR. SCHAEFFER: 8 9 Q Have you finished reading, Mr. Downey? 10 Α Yes. 1.1 Q I want to address your attention first to 12 -- let me see no -- sorry, I've lost my place because I was so busy arguing. 13 14 If you look at the last paragraph in 15 column 2, there's a quotation attributed to you. I'll read the whole thing. 16 "In earlier years PBS had 17 maintained standard program-use policies but dropped 18 them in 1993 when its Board decided to try to get the 19 best possible rights deals relating to programs 20 purchased for broadcast. Downey recalls 'in the ensuing years, producing stations came to feel ill-at-21

They didn't know what to expect from any

1	particular deal. The recent negotiations attempt to
2	give producers more information on the typical
3	division of rights'."
4	Is that a true statement by you?
5	A Yes.
6	Q Now, let's go back to the article itself
7	which says, "four producing stations okay standard
8	contract with PBS". In fact, was there an agreement
9	between PBS and the four so-called, major producing
10	stations that are described in this article?
11	A Before the
12	Q Well, at the time of the article; around
13	October 1996?
14	A PBS is a membership organization owned
15	Q I really think I'm entitled to an answer
16	to my question. And I know we're in arbitration but
17	the question is let me ask it differently. I
18	withdraw the question.
19	The article reads, "PBS and four of its
20	major producing stations reached agreement October
21	17th of 'template' for future production contracts.
22	PBS president, Ervin Duggan announced to the network's

1	Board of Directors the next day".
2	Was that true?
3	A There is a template agreement between PBS
4	and these four stations which was preceded by Board
5	policies that proscribed the relationship between PBS
6	and any producer. This template came into effect at
7	about this time, but it's a template that can be
8	ignored by either side.
9	In other words, either side can propose
10	greater or lesser terms or conditions that vary from
11	the template. This was an effort to reduce to a
12	common set of understandings, what our relationships
13	would be, but it's not binding.
14	Q I most respectfully suggest I'll move
15	on but I do not think that was an appropriate
16	answer to a question that called for a yes or no. By
17	the way, is Mr. Duggan still the president of PBS?
18	A Yes.
19	Q Your experience with Mr. Duggan I am sure,
20	is that he is a truth-teller?
21	A Yes.
22	Q Do you have any reason to believe that the

1	announcement that Mr. Duggan made on October 17th and
2	described in this first paragraph, was any different
3	than that which is described here?
4	A Is this the you're referring to the
5	first paragraph?
6	Q Yes, I am.
7	JUDGE DREYFUS: If you know.
8	THE WITNESS: Well, that continues to be
9	a true statement, if that's what your question is.
10	MR. SCHAEFFER: That's what my question
11	was.
12	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
13	Q Now, the second paragraph suggests that
14	the template defines a range of formulas for income
15	sharing and the respective program rights of the
16	producing stations according to you. Was that
17	correct?
18	A That's correct.
19	Q And the four stations produced between
20	two-thirds and three-fourths of the PBS prime-time
21	schedule. And then it states that there are four
22	stations: WGBH, Boston; WNET, New York; WETA,

Washington; and KCET, Los Angeles. 1 2 Was that also true in 1996? Α I feel the need to comment that these 3 4 stations present between two-thirds and three-5 They don't necessarily produce all of those quarters. 6 programs. 7 That's fine. 0 8 Α Okay. Now, then it goes on to say, in the same column -- I'm skipping a bit -- "PBS has been 9 10 seeking to claim a larger share and greater control of 11 ancillary rights of programs on behalf of member 12 stations who pay a major share of production costs. 13 This is the basis of Duggan's 'station equity model.'" What is the station equity model? 14 15 Α The nature of PBS' relationship with 16 producers has changed over time. As I said a moment 17 ago, many years ago, back in the '70s and '80s, 18 virtually all of PBS' programs came from its member 19 stations. And because of some of the conflicts of --20 potential conflicts of interest we discussed, our 21 relationship with those producers was established as

-- as board policy. That's the way in which the

relationship between vendor and client was -- was overseen or managed.

As we entered the 1990s, and PBS began doing business with -- contracting with companies external to public broadcasting, those board policies were no longer a rational way to do business with a third party independent, even potentially for-profit company.

And so we sought to change the way in which our business -- you know, practices and structure. And in the course of that, the other point I'd make is that policies made in 1980 were in many ways irrelevant, given the changes of technology over time. There was no home video industry in 1980, but we had to take that into account in these new relationships. And so this was an effort to put our relationship with the producers on a more rational business-like footing.

Q Isn't it a fact that in 1996 the station equity model was presented as a way of getting substantial new revenues for PBS?

A I'm sorry. I didn't really answer your

_	question: The station equity model is a deliberate
2	effort on PBS' part to identify sources of revenue for
3	programming that is that are external to the
4	stations themselves from third parties.
5	Q And that program was commenced in 1996
6	under Mr. Duggan's stewardship, wasn't it?
7	A That is correct.
8	Q So that's kind of a change in the way PBS
9	and the public broadcasting withdrawn.
10	That's kind of a change in the way that
11	PBS and the public television stations are going to do
12	business for the future, isn't that correct?
13	A It's "change" isn't quite the right
14	word. It is an added dimension, not a
15	Q "Change" isn't the right word?
16	A Well, it's I don't want to leave the
17	implication that everything we do now is is unique
18	and different somehow.
19	Q But didn't sorry. Did you finish your
20	answer?
21	A That we added the we have always sought
22	funding from third parties. Underwriters are third

1	parties. But this was a more a focused effort to
2	find strong media partners with whom to collaborate in
3	the production of programming for distribution on PBS.
4	That's that's the new part, and that is an add-on
5	to what we do, not a
6	Q Well, I don't want to dwell on this,
7	because we're going to go into this a little later.
8	But isn't this something that Mr. Duggan is it
9	Duggan or Dugan (phonetic)? I'm sorry.
10	A Duggan.
11	Q Duggan takes great pride in describing
12	that under his stewardship in 1996, the station equity
13	model was conceived.
14	A Yes.
15	Q Isn't that correct?
16	A That is correct.
17	Q And why is it called the station equity
18	model?
19	A The point we were trying to convey to
20	stations in the in the naming of this was you
21	know, prior to that time, PBS' essential practice was
22	to rent programs, if you will, to pay the license fee

to a producer for a limited right to exhibit the
program on PBS only, and then the program would, you
know, migrate off to wherever it would go.

The reality, however, was that the license
fees PBS was paying was often equal to the entire cost

fees PBS was paying was often equal to the entire cost of producing the program, and we believe that the stations were, therefore, being shortchanged, and that the stations ought to get a greater return on their investment if they are paying virtually the full cost of producing a program, or proportionately a greater return on whatever their investment was. The rules prior to that, or the policies prior to that, really

Q It's more businesslike to do it the way you're doing it under the station equity model, isn't it?

did not produce that -- that result.

A Yes.

Q Now, let's go back to the -- this column, because we were on common carriage, and I apologize for having been distracted. At the bottom of the first column, Mr. Downey, if you'll follow with me, it says, "Most stations that sought the template did not

NEAL R. GROSS

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1	sign it in the end, however. The 15 large stations of
2	the community station resource group originally asked
3	PBS to create a standard formula for production
4	contracts, but 11 did not accept the final product.
5	"The sticking points, reportedly, were
6	provisions inserted by PBS during summer negotiations
7	that signatory stations would become leaders in
8	encouraging common carriage of programs and co-
9	branding joint use of the PBS logo and their own
LO	station logos." Was that true?
L1	A I can't tell you why some stations elected
L2	not to sign or become signatories to this template
L3	field.
L4	Q Did they ever was it ever suggested to
L5	you by anyone that that was true, other than this
L6	article?
L7	A Yes.
L8	Q Who suggested it?
L9	A I can't recall.
20	Q But a number of people did, didn't they?
21	A There are anecdotes.
22	Q Okay.
- 1	

1	A There are lots of of motives and
2	missions involved here.
3	Q Of course, you don't know what went on in
4	people's minds, but you do know what you were told,
5	and that was one of the things you were told, wasn't
6	it?
7	A That's one of the things I was told.
8	Q Let's move on.
9	MR. SCHAEFFER: Would you I'm going to
10	move that the ASCAP 2X be in evidence.
11	MR. RICH: Your Honors, I confess to being
12	somewhat confused again about the basis on which these
13	are both being offered and, at least as to 1X,
14	admitted into evidence.
15	Again, there are numerous statements
16	attributed to third parties which this witness doesn't
17	adopt, and I hope and trust that the documents are not
18	being admitted, to the extent they are, for the truth
19	of those statements, which again he his last
20	answer, he absolutely distances himself from certain
21	sentiments of third party stations here.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH:

22

I understand.

2	MR. SCHAEFFER: Again, this is a hearsay
3	objection, which I believe is inappropriate here. In
4	fact, he ratifies most of the things that are said
5	anyway, and I believe it's appropriate for the Panel
6	to consider it. The Panel is perfectly capable, in my
7	view, of weighing the value of these articles. And if
8	it thinks they're not good in view of his testimony,
9	they'll do so. It's just a question of getting over
10	the threshold and letting him consider it.
11	MR. RICH: But for Mr. Schaeffer, with
12	respect to use this cant about there is no such thing
13	as a
14	MR. SCHAEFFER: I object to that.
15	MR. RICH: it
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Go ahead.
17	MR. RICH: doesn't address the central
18	concern, which is by definition we are not going, I
19	suppose, in this proceeding to be calling, in
20	connection with 2X, Frederick Breitenfeld, whose name
21	appears at the top of the second column, or Mr.
22	Griffiths, whose name appears at the bottom of the

Mr. Schaeffer?

first column. And whether or not the hearsay --that's the whole purpose of the hearsay rule.

We have no basis for testing the validity of the statement. And particularly where this witness doesn't subscribe to its validity, the idea of simply saying, "Oh, there's no hearsay rule," and indirectly attempting to get it in for the validity of hundreds of statements -- by the time Mr. Schaeffer is done, I'm sure, today -- attributed to third parties seems to me absolutely going to dilute the value of testimony of witnesses in this proceeding.

MR. SCHAEFFER: The remedy for Mr. Rich, who I assume will apologize for using the word "cant," the remedy seems to be to ask his witness on redirect if he believes some statement that he doesn't like is true or untrue. But it seems to me that is not a ground for the Arbitrators not considering this material.

We are up against a very difficult problem here, I might say. We are trying to prove -- and we, I believe, will prove to you -- that PBS and the public stations are a different animal than they were

NEAL R. GROSS

1	a long time ago. We don't have the benefit of
2	depositions. we don't have the benefit of subpoena
3	power. and we have a limited amount of tools in that
4	effort.
5	One of the good ways of doing this is
6	relying, to some extent, on periodicals that this
7	particular witness has already confirmed are accurate
8	periodicals. But that's why in arbitration there is
9	no hearsay rule.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: I'm sorry. Mr.
11	Kleinberg, we have totally ignored you, sir. Do you
12	have any comments?
13	MR. KLEINBERG: As usual, I do.
14	(Laughter.)
15	But I would echo Mr. Schaeffer's comments,
16	and I'll only add this. And this is one of the more
17	interesting aspects of this proceeding. The licensees
18	people who are receiving the compulsory licenses
19	under the statute are the stations, not public
20	broadcasting services.
21	And it is, indeed, sort of like boxing
22	with your hands behind your back to have the actual

1 licensees not here, not called as witnesses, not 2 subpoenable, not deposable, not discoverable, and then be told we can't have any information that comes from 3 4 them or is about them into the proceeding. 5 I suggest that, as Mr. Schaeffer stated, 6 the Panel is perfectly capable of weighing the 7 articles or any of the evidence in the case. 8 say because it's hearsay under some formalistic rule 9 is a little bit ignorant of the facts that we have to 10 deal with here. 11 And I might note that public broadcasting 12 themselves have included articles within their melange 13 of evidence. So I think it's perfectly appropriate to 14 let them in. 1.5 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. 16 MR. RICH: I believe we -- to correct the 17 record, I'm not aware that we have, in even a single 18 instance. We refrain from polluting the record with 19 hearsay, and the documents we cross examined ASCAP, 20 for example, on were admissions by ASCAP contained in 21 court filings and the like.

And I just think we're going down a road

here that -- with respect -- and obviously, it's the Panel's judgment -- that if we have hundreds of documents of the nature of <u>Current</u> magazine quoting everybody imaginable on a subject, I don't think it's -- there's no possible way I can meaningfully cross examine news articles dealing with quotes from third parties.

I think it would be perfectly legitimate to probe this witness' knowledge, his understanding, from as many documents as you want, which Mr. Schaeffer is clearly doing and intends to keep doing. I couldn't and don't object to that.

But to then say because there is supposedly no hearsay rule that these documents come in subject to my having an ability presumably to test the voracity of third party comments -- and I don't know the first thing about these people -- seems to place an unfair and inappropriate burden on our clients.

MR. SCHAEFFER: I can't resist. I don't want to extend this, but the people he is talking about we can't probe are the people that they

NEAL R. GROSS

_	represent, and Ms. bamison, at page 3 of her direct
2	testimony, says they represent.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. Thank
4	you. Give us just a moment, please.
5	All right. The objection is overruled.
6	We simply want to state for the record, and for the
7	benefit of counsel as well, while we recognize that
8	hearsay is contained in this document, we feel that
9	the Panel is capable of determining what is hearsay,
LO	what is triple hearsay, what have you, and we will
L1	accord it which weight that we feel is appropriate.
L2	And we also feel that we are capable of
L3	determining which items contained in the various
L4	articles the witness has agreed to, or which he has
L5	does not agree with, from his testimony and his
L6	evidence. Hearsay, technically, is admissible. We
L7	have to agree with that.
L8	MR. SCHAEFFER: May I move on?
L9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Yes. And get right
20	to the
21	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'll try. The next
22	problem won't be hearsay. I'm going to ask that there
i	

1	be produced to the witness and I'm going to
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Well, let me ask
3	just did you move this?
4	MR. SCHAEFFER: I had moved 2X, yes.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: ASCAP Exhibit 2X is
6	admitted, then, into evidence. Thank you.
7	(Whereupon, the above-referred
8	to document, previously marked
9	as ASCAP Exhibit No. 2X for
LO	identification, was received in
11	evidence.)
L2	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'm next going to ask that
L3	there be directly moved I'm going to move it into
L4	evidence and I understand there is no objection to
L5	it from Weil, Gotshal a PBS statement which we
L6	printed off PBS' web site and dated January 28, 1998.
L7	I would ask that it be admitted in evidence, since
L8	there can't be any question but that it's an
L9	admission, as ASCAP 3X. And I have some questions for
20	the witness.
21	(Whereupon, the above-referred

1	Exhibit No. 3X for
2	identification.)
3	MR. RICH: May I ask Mr. Schaeffer in
4	terms of was this previously denominated with an
5	exhibit number?
6	MR. SCHAEFFER: No. We just printed it
7	off line after and you'll note the date is
8	January 28, 1998.
9	MR. RICH: So your statement that we
10	didn't object to
11	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'm sorry. I apologize
12	MR. RICH: is based on the fact that we
13	had never seen this document.
14	MR. SCHAEFFER: I apologize, Mr. Rich. I
15	do apologize.
16	MR. RICH: I'd like a chance to read it.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
18	MR. SCHAEFFER: You certainly can.
19	And while he's doing that, maybe the
20	witness could look at it also and save some time.
21	MR. RICH: If I may react
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Yes, please.

1	MR. RICH: Mr. Chairman. Our position
2	has been with respect to materials appearing on the
3	web sites of PBS, NPR, and CPB, that where the
4	information appearing is authored by one of those
5	entities we have no objection. It's impossible,
6	looking for the first time at this document now, to
7	know whether this document so qualifies, or rather
8	whether it is a republication of a third party article
9	that may have been carried.
10	There is no byline. There is no source of
11	authorship, and sitting here at this moment,
12	therefore, I'm not in a position to evaluate whether
13	this truly is an authored by PBS document or
14	otherwise. Perhaps the witness can illuminate that.
15	But without that knowledge, I'm not in a position to
16	do other than lodge an objection, at least pending
17	learning a bit more about the providence of the
18	document.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
20	Mr. Schaeffer?
21	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes. Without responding,
22	because maybe we can save

1	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
2	Q Mr. Downey, isn't this a PBS press
3	release?
4	A Actually, the PBS Sponsorship Group is
5	separately incorporated.
6	Q I didn't ask you that. Isn't this
7	something that was released by PBS? If you look in
8	the lower left-hand corner, don't you see that? PBS
9	org, inside PBS news, second quarter?
LO	A Evidently, it was on the PBS web site.
L1	Q Yes.
L2	A But you asked me that's not what you
L3	asked me. You asked me, is this a PBS document? And
L4	there as I said, and mindful of your colloquy a
L5	moment ago, this may have, in fact, been authored by
L6	the Sponsorship Group which is separately
L7	incorporated.
L8	Q And carried by PBS on its web site?
L9	A That is true.
20	MR. SCHAEFFER: I submit that if PBS has
21	put something on its web site, it has adopted it
22	sufficiently for it to be substantive evidence.

1	MR. RICH: We have no objection to this
2	document.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
4	MR. SCHAEFFER: Let me move on, then.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: It will be received
6	as ASCAP Exhibit 3X.
7	(Whereupon, the above-referred
8	to document, previously marked
9	as ASCAP Exhibit No. 3X for
10	identification, was received in
11	evidence.)
12	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
13	Q Do you know why this is do you have an
14	understanding as to the reason why this is dated from
15	Pasadena, California, on January 8, 1998?
16	A Yes.
17	Q What is that?
18	A Semiannually, PBS participates in what is
19	commonly referred to as the Press Tour. It's a
20	gathering in the Los Angeles area of the television
21	press critics for the purpose of looking at new
22	programming for the upcoming season or six-month

	period, and that was neid in the Television Critics
2	Association actually organizes this tour, and it was
3	held in Pasadena this past January.
4	Q Now, the PBS Sponsorship Group that is
5	listed that is set forth in the first sentence of
6	this document, that's the group of stations that we
7	previously referred to in your earlier testimony?
8	Well, let me withdraw it. Withdrawn.
9	What's the PBS Sponsorship Group?
10	A The PBS Sponsorship Group is a nonprofit
11	corporation that consists of representatives from or
12	it represents four public television stations and PBS.
13	Q And those are the four major producers
14	that were previously referred to?
15	A Yes.
16	Q KCET and WNET, WGBH
17	A Yes.
18	Q and the Washington station?
19	A Yes.
20	Q And why is it called the Sponsorship
21	Group?
22	A This group banded together and formed the

1	Sponsorship Group to try to improve the efficiency, I
2	guess, and the effectiveness of these stations and
3	PBS' fundraising efforts.
4	Q Its explicit job is to go out and get
5	corporate underwriting, isn't it?
6	A So far, it has focused on corporations,
7	but it will be expanding to include government and
8	foundation underwriting as well.
9	Q Well, of course, the first sentence of
10	this says, "The PBS Sponsorship Group, public
11	television's up and coming corporate sales and support
12	force, attracted \$7.5 million in new program
13	sponsorships during its second quarter which ended
14	December 31, Ervin S. Duggan, PBS President and Chief
15	Executive Officer, announced today." Do you have any
16	reason to believe that an announcement by Mr. Duggan
17	that's carried on PBS' web site is inaccurate?
18	A No.
19	Q So that Mr. Duggan described this as an up
20	and coming corporate sales and support force. Do you
21	think he was mistaken in so describing it?
22	A I don't think I suggested he was mistaken.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	I said
2	Q I
3	A in the future, it is anticipated this
4	group will undertake federal and foundation and
5	grant
6	Q But for the present that is, in 1998
7	it's concentrating on corporate, and that's why it's
8	called the corporate sales and support force, isn't
9	that right?
10	A That's correct.
11	Q Thank you.
12	And it is true, in fact, that during the
13	second quarter ended December 31, the PBS Sponsorship
14	Group did attract \$7.5 million, isn't that correct?
15	A I believe this to be truthful. I don't
16	independently know.
17	Q And it's interesting it's called
18	sponsorships, and it's called the Sponsor Group. Is
19	that because the underwriters from whom it was seeking
20	money are really sponsors? Isn't that why it's called
21	the Sponsorship Group?
22	A Well, the term "sponsor" is in common use

1	in the area of philanthropy. It's a term to describe
2	the person who supplied the money, and I think this
3	group felt it was a better term than underwriter or
4	supporter or patron.
5	Q Isn't it your understanding the word
6	"sponsor" is frequently used in commercial
7	broadcasting as well?
8	A Yes.
9	Q And what is your understanding of the word
LO	"sponsor" to mean in commercial broadcasting?
L1	A A person who pays for an advertisement.
L2	Q I see. And then this goes on Mr.
13	Duggan goes on to say, "In its six-month existence,
L4	the PBS Sponsorship Group has brought in \$11.5 million
L5	in corporate support." That's true also, isn't it?
L6	A I will take this at face value, yes.
17	Q And it then goes on to list, in the second
18	paragraph, certain programs that are got corporate
19	that were the recipient of corporate funding. But
20	I want to point out to you, the last sentence says,
21	"The sponsors include Polaroid, Delta Tools, Lilipons
22	Water Gardens, Porter Cable, and Thompson-Minwax

1	Company. Additional underwriting partners will be
2	announced soon."
3	So that would indicate, would it not, that
4	at least in 1998, as opposed to, say, 1980, or
5	something like that, PBS is treating underwriting
6	partners as sponsors, is that correct?
7	A Well, as I said a moment ago,
8	"sponsorship" is a term used in philanthropy to mean
9	a party that contributes money voluntarily to for
LO	some good work. It is also used in commercial
L1	broadcasting in a somewhat different context, which,
L2	as I said a moment ago, is somebody who pays for an
L3	advertisement. Now
L4	Q Now
L5	A I think you have to be mindful that
L6	that there are different uses of the term.
L7	Q Now, with respect to the PBS Sponsorship
L8	Group then I'll leave this alone for a minute do
L9	you have an understanding that they have any
20	withdrawn.
21	Your understanding is that they are going
22	to go on and continue trying to attract corporate

1	support, isn't that correct?
2	A That is their purpose, yes.
3	Q Just forgive me. I may be able to save a
4	little
5	A Oh, okay.
6	Q I think I'm going to just put this aside.
7	I'll move on to the next one.
8	Do you have any is there something
9	called PBS National Program Funding Standards and
LO	Practices?
L1	A Yes.
L2	Q What is that?
L3	A They are more familiarly known as the PBS
L4	Underwriting Guidelines. It's the rules and
L5	regulations that apply to the both the acceptance
L6	of corporations as underwriters of particular
L7	corporation foundations and others, as underwriters of
L8	particular programs, as well as the rules that apply
L9	to the actual announcement that goes on the air.
20	Q And what is your do you have any
21	current role with respect to those guidelines? I'll
22	call them guidelines. It's easier.

1	A	Yes.
2	Q	What's your role?
3	A	I'm in charge of them, I guess you could
4	say.	
5	Q	Are there amended from time to time?
6	A	They are.
7	Q	When was the last time they were amended?
8	A	Last Friday.
9	Q	And that was amended by the PBS Board?
10	A	Yes.
11	Q	Well, I'll get to that in a minute.
12	That's news	to me. But, then again
13		MR. SCHAEFFER: I'm going to ask that a
14	copy of the	document as it existed February 2, 1997,
15	which is who	at I received from Mr. Rich the other day,
16	be marked a	s ASCAP Exhibit 4X.
17		(Whereupon, the above-referred
18		to document was marked as ASCAP
19		Exhibit No. 4X for
20		identification.)
21		MR. RICH: I won't object to this
22	document.	I will note the irony, however, of the fact

that I had proposed to Messrs. Schaeffer and Kleinberg a week ago that given the obvious intention of ASCAP and/or BMI to explore this area, that I be permitted to adduce this on direct examination and was met with a rebuff from BMI's counsel to the effect that it was not supported by any written direct testimony.

Talk about sauce for the goose and gander.

It's obvious that apparently the view of ASCAP -- and

I assume BMI -- as to what's relevant on cross is not

bounded by direct, except where I would define direct

in a fashion that would encompass the same documents.

I'm totally baffled by this.

However, since I think this is an important subject, which I believe is relevant to the Panel -- and notwithstanding ASCAP's and BMI's own position that it exceeded the bounds of the direct examination -- I won't object either to the admission of this document in evidence or to cross examination on it, with the full understanding that on redirect I'll have a full and ample opportunity to add such questioning of the witness as is appropriate to put it in the proper context.

NEAL R. GROSS

1	MR. SCHAEFFER: I only respond for myself
2	because I'm sure Mr. Rich has spoke. I have never
3	objected, nor did I rebuff in any way, Mr. Rich, your
4	proposal. It was entirely my co-counsel, and you
5	never asked me you were supposed to call me on
6	Friday afternoon at 5:00. You didn't choose to do so.
7	MR. RICH: Having received a letter from
8	BMI
9	MR. SCHAEFFER: But not from me. But not
10	from me, Mr. Rich, because I had no opposition to it.
11	I mean, I just want to go on record as saying I have
12	not done that, and I think Mr. Rich
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: If I understand,
14	the issue that the Panel is particularly concerned
15	with at the moment is you do not object, so,
16	therefore, the document is admitted as ASCAP's Exhibit
17	4X.
18	(Whereupon, the above-referred
19	to document, previously marked
20	as ASCAP Exhibit No. 4X for
21	identification, was received in
22	evidence.)

1	MR. RICH: We do not object.
2	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Thank you.
3	MR. SCHAEFFER: Thank you.
4	JUDGE GULIN: If I may also make a moment.
5	I think it would be more appropriate for counsel to
6	direct their comments to the Panel
7	MR. SCHAEFFER: I would
8	JUDGE GULIN: rather than engage in
9	colloquy.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
11	MR. SCHAEFFER: I apologize if I have done
12	that. But the fact of the matter is that I believe
13	JUDGE GULIN: I understand.
14	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
15	Q This is, I take it 4X, I take it, is
16	the guidelines as of February 2nd. Just in the
17	interest of expediency, what changes were made?
18	A We frequently make what I'll call
19	housekeeping changes from time to time. For example,
20	the not so long ago the FDA changed its regulations
21	with respect to television advertisements involving
22	prescription pharmaceuticals that necessitated a

1	change a conforming change to our guidelines.
2	And the most recent change actually
3	involved sponsorship again. The Board affirmed that
4	the term "sponsored by" is not appropriate for use on
5	PBS, but did allow, under certain circumstances, the
6	noun "sponsor" or "sponsorship" may be used.
7	Q Was there also a change in the frequency
8	in which a sponsor or underwriter could withdrawn.
9	Was there also a change involving the
10	multiple sponsors or multiple underwriters having
11	their names set forth in a given period of time?
12	A I'm sorry. I don't understand.
13	Q Isn't it a fact that there was a change
14	that formally if there were two or three sponsors
15	or underwriters, their names had to be set forth in a
16	limited period of time consecutively?
17	A The
18	Q Why don't you tell us about that change.
19	A Yes. The I believe it was this most
20	recent
21	Q Yes.
22	A or this February document where for the

1	first time the policy states that the underwriting
2	I'll call it pod, P-O-D, the period of time develop
3	devoted to on the underwriting messages of a
4	program can be up to a minute in length, where it
5	previously had been 30 seconds.
6	Q And when you say "the pod," what do you
7	mean by "the pod"?
8	A Well, we put all of our underwriting
9	announcements together. If there are two underwriting
10	announcements in a program, they have to be back to
11	back or
12	Q I see.
13	A three or four or six or however many
14	there are. They have to go together in a package or
15	a pod.
16	Q And how has this changed? I'm sorry. I
17	don't understand.
18	Q What's the new change?
19	A One of the one of the phenomena we are
20	experiencing is that it's less often that well,
21	it's more it's more frequently the case that we
22	have to have we end up with more underwriters in a

1	program, two or three or four, rather than one or two.
2	And so it was necessary to expand the amount of time
3	available for underwriting announcement.
4	Previously, 30 seconds was the limit,
5	although there are always exceptions that can be
6	granted in unusual circumstances. But we expanded
7	that limit to one minute.
8	Q Does that mean now that the intervals
9	between the announcements for the underwriters can be
10	increased?
11	A The intervals between do you mean
12	Q Between the particular announcements of
13	the particular underwriter or the particular sponsor.
14	A Well, any single announcement can be up to
15	15 seconds.
16	Q So
17	A And the total and the total of all of
18	the announcements can be up to 60 seconds. So you
19	could have four 15s or
20	Q Or any combination or
21	A Right.
22	Q interval in between.

1	A I'm not sure what you mean by "interval in
2	between."
3	Q Well, you could for example, one
4	sponsor could do 15 seconds at the beginning of 60
5	minutes 60 seconds, and the second sponsor at the
6	end do 15 seconds, which would give a maybe a
7	matter of attention maybe you wouldn't have so much
8	confusion. They wouldn't be back to back. Isn't that
9	correct?
10	A Well, I think a careful reading of this
11	I think will still will show that the they are
12	supposed to be identified in the in the descending
13	order of their contribution.
14	Q I see. So it's a matter of how much they
15	pay?
16	A Well, we acknowledge the the largest
17	contributor first, and the next largest second, and so
18	on.
19	Q Incidentally, you've doubled, then, the
20	advertising withdrawn.
21	You've doubled the time that's devoted to
22	underwriters' announcements, isn't that
1	

1	A We've doubled the maximum amount of time
2	allowable but not necessarily every program doesn't
3	necessarily have two or more underwriters.
4	Q Well, if the underwriter insists, though,
5	it could be now 60 seconds as opposed to 30 seconds.
6	A No, no, no. It has nothing to do with
7	underwriters insisting.
8	Q Whose insistence is it?
9	A It's the producer who and PBS who
10	determine what the content of the underwriting
11	announcement will be.
12	Q And it's the producer who gets the money
13	from the underwriter for the show, isn't that right?
14	A Unless it's the PBS Sponsorship Group.
15	Q Isn't that correct?
16	A Yes.
17	Q And if the underwriter says it's a
18	condition of giving you money, "I want more time
19	rather than less," one would anticipate the producer
20	might be amenable to that?
21	A Well, the amount of time is, as I said,
22	maximum 15 seconds. And to the extent we're able to

1	produce there is no kind of formal rule that for
2	one million you get this, and two million you get
3	that, or 100,000 you get the other. And so that is
4	managed by the producers with input from PBS, frankly,
5	to try to keep the time down to a minimum.
6	Q Now, look at C1 and 2. I just want to see
7	if I understood that correctly. That's policy
8	application. Do you see where I'm talking about?
9	A On page 2?
10	Q On page 2. You're familiar with that
11	section, aren't you?
12	A Yes.
13	Q Now, what is the difference between policy
14	application by PBS and by PBS member stations? What's
15	that all about?
16	A These are the guidelines that PBS uses in
17	the course of business with respect to programs
18	distributed by PBS. However, the Board of Directors
19	has encouraged all stations to adopt this the
20	essence or the sense of these guidelines in their
21	local operations.
22	Q But it also says, does it not,

1	"Nevertheless, producers and funders should be aware
2	that individual judgments may differ in a given
3	situation, even when the same policies are being
4	administered, and that individual public television
5	licensees may administer local program underwriting
6	policies that vary from these policies." Do you see
7	that?
8	A Yes.
9	Q Doesn't that mean that the PBS membership
10	stations can pretty well do what they please, subject
11	to FCC regulations?
12	A The members stations can absolutely do
13	what they please, subject to FCC regulations.
14	Q So these guidelines are really guidelines
15	that PBS recommends but are not binding on the local
16	stations, isn't that correct?
17	A That is correct.
18	Q They are kind of do you know the word
19	"precatory"?
20	A Yes.
21	Q Thank you.
22	Now, I wanted to go over some of them. So

1	formally, the credits may be 15 seconds long and
2	appear at the beginning and end of the particular
3	program, correct?
4	A Yes.
5	Q But now that has been changed somewhat,
6	hasn't it? Can they be
7	A No.
8	Q longer?
9	A Not long well, any individual message
10	can be up to 15 seconds.
11	Q So you could have more messages?
12	A The aggregate cannot exceed 60 seconds.
13	Q So you might now have two sponsors
14	excuse me two underwriters at the beginning, each
15	15 seconds, and two underwriters, two sponsors at the
16	end for 15 seconds. Is that correct?
17	A No.
18	Q Well, then, I don't understand.
19	A Under these policies first of all,
20	underwriting credits appear at the beginning and the
21	end of the program.
22	Q Right.

1	A There are some exceptions to that, but for
2	these purposes assume beginning and end. One minute
3	a one-minute interval is allowed at the beginning,
4	and a one-minute interval at the end, up to one
5	minute. It's not required that it be one minute.
6	And within that one minute, you are
7	obliged to identify all of the third parties who have
8	contributed to the cost of this production. Any
9	single announcement cannot exceed 15 seconds. You
10	could have a maximum of four 15-second announcements,
11	or six 10-second announcements, or 60 one-second
12	announcements, but that's all you can have.
13	Q I understand. Now, what are the
14	exceptions you just referred to?
15	A It'll take me a minute to find it. Maybe
16	you know where it is.
17	Q I don't.
18	MR. RICH: While the witness is looking,
19	I just would observe he's been on cross examination
20	MR. SCHAEFFER: Want to take a break?
21	MR. RICH: without a break for a
22	considerable time. I don't know what the Panel's

1	intention is, or Mr. Schaeffer's, for a lunch break.
2	And maybe we can inquire of the witness if he's
3	content to proceed with
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Downey
5	MR. SCHAEFFER: Whatever your pleasure.
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: do you need five
7	minutes, or lunch?
8	THE WITNESS: In a few minutes would be
9	appropriate. We don't have to do it this minute.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Why don't we take
11	just five minutes right now, and then
12	MR. SCHAEFFER: Sure.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: we'll come back
14	and
15	MR. SCHAEFFER: Great.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: take our lunch
17	break at 1:00 or
18	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes, I'll be going on the
19	afternoon. There's no doubt.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
21	(Whereupon, the proceedings in the
22	foregoing matter went off the record at

1	12:30 p.m. and went back on the record at
2	12:38 p.m.)
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Schaeffer and
4	Mr. Rich, and other counsel and parties, why don't we
5	try to go until 1:15 to avoid some of the kids up
6	there who
7	MR. SCHAEFFER: Swell.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: are here to see
9	the cherry blossoms.
10	MR. SCHAEFFER: Swell. That would be
11	swell.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: And I'll recommend
13	to all of you that
14	(Laughter.)
15	MR. SCHAEFFER: It's nice to see a
16	facility so much used.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Yes. Please.
18	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
19	Q You've testified, I think, that under PBS
20	guidelines credits can be no longer than 15 seconds,
21	is that correct?
22	A Any single credit.

1	Q Yes, single I meant a single credit.
2	I'm sorry. Thank you.
3	In fact, though, isn't it a fact that many
4	of the stations in the United States allow
5	announcements for up to 30 seconds, which is the FCC
6	guideline?
7	A It's my understanding there is perhaps two
8	dozen of the 175 who have, to some extent or another
9	and it depends on the content of the message but
10	allow underwriting credits of 30 seconds duration,
11	yes.
12	Q Sitting here today, could you tell us the
13	approximate market share of the stations you've just
14	described that do allow 30 seconds, what cities they
15	are in? One of them is Houston, isn't it?
16	A I believe that's correct.
17	Q Any others that you can think of in fairly
18	big cities in the United States?
19	A These stations tend to be major market
20	stations, but it's not it's not every major market.
21	Washington, D.C., for example, does not accept 30
22	seconds.

1	Q Well, what do you mean by a "major market
2	station"?
3	A Larger markets, like New York does, but
4	Boston and Washington don't, Houston does, Dallas
5	does. San Francisco allows, to a limited extent, 30-
6	second announcements, particularly for foundations.
7	It varies from market to market, but it's more
8	frequently found in large cities than small.
9	Q And the 30-second limit is a function of
10	the FCC's regulations, isn't it?
11	A No.
12	Q No?
13	A The Commission has never at least
14	insofar as noncommercial television is concerned, has
15	never stated any length as being too long or too
16	short. The Commission allows public television
17	stations well, with respect to programs, Section 17
18	317 of the Commission's regulations requires that
19	we disclose third party funding. That is, the
20	underlying, you know, reason for underwriting credits.
21	The Commission has never stated any particular length
22	as being acceptable or unacceptable.

In addition, local stations who accept contributions from corporations to support, example, the cost of daily operations are permitted by the Commission to announce that fact, to give credit to those corporations on the air in the form of what are called "local support announcements" or "day part announcements" or "general support announcements," and those are local underwriting messages. They may be of, you know, very brief duration. They may be up to 30 seconds.

I believe there are some that have been longer than 30 seconds.

You said that the reason for underlying credits is disclosure of who paid for a particular program. But from a number of the underwriters or now called sponsors, from their point of view, one of the reasons for giving them credit is to get credit, isn't it, with the community or with their customers or with the audience?

> That may be one of the motives, yes. Α

But you don't have any serious doubt that 0 for a number of major American corporations part of their motivation for giving underwriting grants is to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

1	get their name in front of the audience there's no
2	doubt about that in your mind, is there?
3	A That is true for some corporations, yes.
4	Q All right. I'm not going to ask you to
5	by the way, has there ever been a study made by your
6	by PBS or CPB of the motivation of the American
7	corporate community to give underwriting?
8	A I can't recall a specific study. There is
9	lots of anecdotal evidence, but I don't recall a
LO	specific study.
L1	Q It is true, is it not, that under even
L2	your and I say "even" under the PBS guidelines,
L3	a corporate underwriter or a sponsor can use its
L4	corporate symbol or trademark, isn't that correct?
L5	A The Commission's rules specifically permit
L6	the use of logograms, yes.
L7	Q And you certainly don't I'm sorry. I
L8	apologize.
L9	PBS certainly doesn't suggest that a
20	station should not use a corporate logo or a trademark
21	or a trade name?
22	A That's correct.

1	Q And, for example, isn't it also true that
2	under your own guidelines corporate slogans can be
3	used, subject to certain limits?
4	A Subject to certain limits, yes.
5	Q For example, you could, if you were Ford
6	Motor Company, say, "Ford Motor Corporation, the maker
7	of the great new Taurus," that would be okay, wouldn't
8	it?
9	A No.
10	Q All right. Well, how about the maker of
11	the new Taurus?
12	A That would be acceptable.
13	Q The difference is the word "great"?
14	A That is correct.
15	Q And could they say, "Ford makes Taurus, a
16	fine car" as opposed to "a great car"?
17	A I think that would be not not
18	acceptable.
19	Q Is that something that is debatable, in
20	your view, because somebody might say it's not a
21	comparison? "Fine car" means a good car. It doesn't
22	mean it's better than a Chevy or a Ford. Isn't that

1	the issue?
2	A There is a great deal of debate about what
3	constitutes a comparative or a qualitative term, which
4	is impermissible.
5	Q Yes. I mean, for example, if Ford said,
6	"Ford Motor Company. We make fine cars," that's not
7	to say that Chevrolet doesn't make fine cars. So that
8	would be permissible, presumably?
9	A Well, again
10	MR. RICH: Objection.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Do you want to
12	state the basis for your objection?
13	MR. RICH: This is just counsel's
14	supposition and argumentation with the witness.
15	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'm arguing with an
16	expert
17	JUDGE GULIN: He has already answered the
18	question. He said "fine" wouldn't be
19	MR. SCHAEFFER: But I think he may change
20	his mind. That's why I want to
21	JUDGE GULIN: Well, explore that.
22	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes.

ᆚᅵ	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
2	Q Isn't it true that it's comparatives that
3	are prohibited, not the quality of the product itself?
4	A I believe qualitative terms are
5	prohibited.
6	Q Well, for example, isn't "DeBeers, a
7	diamond is forever" often used on underwriting?
8	A I believe that's a that is not an
9	underwriting message that has ever been accepted by
10	PBS.
11	Q Could you put a toll number or a web site
12	on your announcement under the PBS guideline?
13	A Until about a year ago, PBS did not allow
14	800 numbers or web site addresses, even though the
15	Commission explicitly permits them. But we changed
16	our policy about a year ago.
17	Q You changed it in 1997, about a year ago?
18	A Yes.
19	Q And I assume that was done because it
20	would encourage underwriting to make that change?
21	A Encourage?
22	Q The making allowing an underwriter or

1	sponsor to put its web site or its toll number on the
2	screen would make it more attractive to that
3	underwriter or sponsor to give money, isn't that so?
4	A There were a couple of reasons.
5	Q Is that one of the reasons?
6	A That's one of the reasons.
7	Q Okay. Now, it is also true that you can
8	have a celebrity's voice making the announcement
9	for example, Bob Hope in my day, which was important,
10	or Lawrence Welk, but for more modern people maybe
11	Bruce Springsteen or Rock Hudson or well, I don't
12	know a great movie star. There voice could be
13	heard, right?
14	A We don't allow celebrities, but we do
15	allow a celebrity's voice, so long as the celebrity is
16	not identified.
17	Q But a corporate executive could appear?
18	A Under certain limited circumstances.
19	Q And isn't it true also that some of the
20	stations use celebrities? And I'm thinking
21	particularly of Jonathan Price.
22	A I'm sorry. I can't really speak to what

1	individual stations may do around the country, at
2	least not in that respect.
3	Q You never that KER has used Jonathan Price
4	as a spokesman for programs?
5	A I was not aware of that, no.
6	Q Okay. All right. Has there ever been any
7	kind of study made of the degree to which local
8	television stations comply with the PBS guidelines?
9	A The only thing that comes to mind is we
10	did at one point ask stations whether they were
11	willing to abide by the PBS guidelines, and I recall
12	that about two-thirds said that they either would or
13	did.
14	Q Was that ever embodied in any report?
15	A I think that was reported to the
16	really, it's a dim recollection. It was reported to
17	the PBS Board, but I don't recall
18	Q How long ago was that?
19	A It would be probably back in 1995 when the
20	controversy we were discussing earlier in this <u>Current</u>
21	article was was raging.
22	Q Which controversy was that, common

1	carriage?
2	A The common carriage
3	Q I see.
4	A The common carriage and underwriting
5	guidelines issues were companion issues that arose at
6	the same time.
7	Q Now, are you acquainted with an
8	organization called APTS?
9	A Yes.
10	Q What is APTS?
11	A America's Public Television Stations is
12	the essentially the lobbying group for public
13	television. It manages the relationships with the
14	Congress with the regulatory agencies.
15	Q Is PBS a member of that or
16	A No.
17	Q contributed to that? Is PBS a
18	contributor to APTS?
19	A Not financial contributor, no.
20	Q Does it contribute effort or support?
21	A When we're asked for assistance for, you
22	know, for example, providing data or whatever, yes.

1	Q You regard that, I assume, as a friend?
2	A We regard APTS as a friend, yes.
3	Q And who supports APTS?
4	A It has it is supported to members, just
5	as PBS is. And it's the same stations who constitute
6	the membership of APTS.
7	Q It's kind of a sibling. Is that a fair
8	A A sister
9	Q Okay.
LO	A organization.
11	Q Okay. Now, are you aware that in 1997
L2	APTS made some started lobbying for some changes in
13	the FCC rules, or not-for-profits?
L4	A I'm really not very familiar with that.
15	Q Okay. Is the prohibition on comparable
L6	product advertising an FCC restriction, or is that
L7	some other kind of restriction?
L8	A The Commission's regulations obtaining to
L9	to advertising do contain specific limitations,
20	such as or including comparatives and superlatives,
21	calls to action, inducements to buy or rent or lease,
22	price information. The PBS guidelines are built on

1	those but are, at the end of the day, more
2	conservative than what the Commission would allow.
3	Q So that, really, if the FCC changed its
4	rules as to not-for-profits being able to have
5	sponsors make calls to action or use comparative
6	advertising, the local television stations then could
7	go ahead and do those things, isn't that correct
8	the local public television stations?
9	A That is correct.
10	Q And it has not I'm going to put
11	something in front of you. It may not refresh your
12	recollection, but I'm going to put what was marked as
13	Exhibit 713.29 and I ask that it be marked for
14	identification.
15	JUDGE GULIN: 5X?
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. It will
17	be ASCAP's Exhibit 5X.
18	(Whereupon, the above-referred
19	to document was marked as ASCAP
20	Exhibit No. 5X for
21	identification.)
22	MR. SCHAEFFER: And I'm just going to ask

1	that it be put in front of the witness to see if it
2	refreshes his recollection as to whether or not there
3	was, in fact, a lobbying effort by APTS in April 21,
4	1997 in April 1997 to get the FCC to relax the
5	comparative and superlative and call to action
6	restrictions.
7	THE WITNESS: I do recall that.
8	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
9	Q You do recall that that occurred?
10	A Yes.
11	Q What inspires that refreshed recollection
12	in this document? The first couple of paragraphs?
13	A Yes.
14	Q Okay. And by the way, are you familiar
15	with <u>Electronic Media</u> , the periodical from which this
16	comes, published by Crain?
17	A Yes.
18	Q What is <u>Electronic Media</u> ?
19	A It's a periodical having to do with the
20	electronic industry.
21	Q Generally accepted and trade?
22	A I guess. I

1	Q Do you know Hatch, by any chance?
2	A I'm sorry?
3	Q Do you know Mr. Hatch, who apparently
4	wrote this article?
5	A No, I don't.
6	Q In any event, it refreshes your
7	recollection that there was an effort by APTS to get
8	the FCC to relax its the restrictions of the FCC?
9	A I recall there was some some lobbying
10	or some conversation, shall we say, about calls to
11	action. But I really I wasn't particularly
12	involved with it. These activities are handled by a
13	different department at PBS, and I and I really
14	have no special recollection or knowledge.
15	MR. SCHAEFFER: All right. I'm not going
16	to offer this in evidence. I think that it succeeded
17	in its purpose of refreshing the witness'
18	recollection, as far as I'm concerned.
19	I'm going to open a question which I think
20	may be the subject of some debate, so that may take a
21	little time.
22	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:

1	Q You've testified you were the underwriting
2	you are the underwriting compliance officer at PBS?
3	A Yes.
4	Q And from time to time, when local stations
5	violate PBS guidelines or do or have inquiries
6	about PBS guidelines, does that fall within your
7	jurisdiction?
8	A Stations are not responsible to me.
9	Stations operations within, you know within
10	their stations are they are responsible only to
11	themselves, their boards, and the FCC.
12	Q Do you or anybody under your supervision
13	from time to time communicate with the local stations
14	about their underwriting announcements?
15	A We are for example, we are sometimes
16	asked by local stations our opinion as to whether a
17	particular announcement complies with PBS guidelines
18	or with the FCC's guidelines.
19	Q Now, I'll preface my next question my
20	next questions with this comment, which I think is
21	known to everybody else in the room.
22	White & Case has searched the Internet for

	web sites which purport to be or claim to be those of
2	local public broadcasting television stations which
3	are represented by PBS and that station that
4	withdrawn. Let me start this off again.
5	White & Case has searched the Internet for
6	web sites which claim to be those of local PBS-
7	represented TV stations, and printed the results out
8	sometime in August and September 1997. Now, you would
9	have no reason to assume that if a station appears on
10	the web site the web page that anybody would be
11	counterfeiting that, I assume.
12	MR. RICH: I object to the form of the
13	question.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: The objection is
15	sustained.
16	MR. SCHAEFFER: All right.
17	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
18	Q In any event, as I've said before, White &
19	Case has searched the Internet. I'm going to put
20	before you the results of that search with respect to
21	approximately 20 stations, and ask for your comments
22	as to whether or not you believe that the station's

announcements violate the spirit or the letter of the PBS guideline, and whether you think, given those guidelines in the FCC regulations, the announcements are appropriate.

MR. RICH: I will certainly object. This

MR. RICH: I will certainly object. This is so far outside the scope of this witness' direct testimony as to I would think not even be debatable as to be outside of proper scope of cross examination.

CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Okay.

Mr. Schaeffer?

MR. SCHAEFFER: We have here the chief compliance officer of PBS with respect to underwriting. It is impossible for you to understand or know what is going out, in terms of solicitation by the stations, without seeing what they are. So far, you've heard generalizations and opinions from a number of experts, and the like.

We have here a unique opportunity that we have the man, the only person on the television side, who is going to be able to discuss intelligently with us whether or not the underwriting that we're describing -- the underwriting messages -- are

consistent with the quidelines, and to what extent 1 that they are commercial, which goes very much to the 2. 3 heart of our case. 4 It seems to me this is in -- I had 5 previously offered this material, because I didn't think it needed sponsorship, because I think they are 6 admissions by the 7 all local stations who are 8 represented by PBS. 9 I know of no other way that we can 10 intelligently -- unless it is accepted on that basis, 11 which I gather has not yet been decided. I'm offering 12 to show it to this witness, so we can explore whether 13 or not it's appropriate under their own quidelines, under the FCC guidelines, and discuss intelligently 14 15 what those messages are. So at this point, you're 16 JUDGE GULIN: 17 merely presenting them to the witness as hypothetical 18 messages, and you're wanting to know whether these 19 hypothetical messages would violate --20 MR. SCHAEFFER: Well, they're not 21 hypothetical. We know, because we've had testimony --22 I mean, I assume we can have different witnesses put

1	their testimony Ms. Grajeda testified where she got
2	it from, and nobody nobody got
3	JUDGE GULIN: But they're not in evidence
4	at this point, right?
5	MR. SCHAEFFER: They're not in evidence
6	JUDGE GULIN: Well, they are in evidence,
7	but we have a pending motion.
8	MR. SCHAEFFER: That's right. And so I
9	would propose to show this to the witness and go over
10	it with him, so for heaven's sake you can see what it
11	is the stations are doing which we claim maybe
12	they're right, maybe we're wrong we claim this is
13	about as commercial as you can get and just like the
14	commercial broadcasters. Maybe we're wrong. That
15	will be for you to decide. But certainly, you should
16	have the opportunity of seeing what it is.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Kleinberg?
18	MR. KLEINBERG: I have nothing, Your
19	Honor.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
21	MR. RICH: May I just
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Yes.
	1

1	MR. RICH: clarify that my objection
2	transcends the issue of whether this is a proper
3	sponsoring witness.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Yes.
5	MR. RICH: It's that the subject matter of
6	those documents about which he is being asked to
7	testify is light years beyond his direct testimony.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
9	JUDGE GULIN: And I guess Mr. Schaeffer's
10	point is it is within the scope of
11	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes. He
12	JUDGE GULIN: his direct, because he
13	has indicated that sponsors are something different on
14	PBS as commercial.
15	MR. SCHAEFFER: There is commercial, but
16	there's something else. He has testified that there
17	have been there are restrictions on what they can
18	do in underwriting, that it's different from the
19	commercial stations.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: And your question
21	goes to whether the initial question goes to
22	whether or not this is a violation of their policy.

	MR. SCHAEFFER: Right. And then isn't
2	and then I'm going to ask him, isn't this just like a
3	commercial?
4	Would you like to take a lunch break so
5	you can discuss it?
6	JUDGE GULIN: I don't know that that will
7	be necessary.
8	MR. SCHAEFFER: Okay.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
10	JUDGE DREYFUS: Counsel, have you seen
11	these documents yet?
12	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes, you have. They are
13	the attachments to our direct case.
14	MR. RICH: There are 500 documents. I
15	don't know which one specifically Mr. Schaeffer has in
16	mind.
17	MR. SCHAEFFER: We'll be glad to show it
18	to him at the break.
19	May I suggest we show it to him at the
20	break, and then
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: That's okay.
22	That's what we were discussing.

1	The objection, at this point, is
2	overruled, subject to our ruling on the pending
3	motion.
4	MR. SCHAEFFER: May I suggest and I
5	know we were going to do it at 1:15 why don't we
6	separate the documents, give them the set, and we can
7	return, whatever is convenient. Then they both can
8	look at them over lunch. It might save time.
9	JUDGE GULIN: What time do you want to
10	return?
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: What time do you
12	want to return?
13	MR. SCHAEFFER: Whatever is good for the
14	Panel and for Mr. Rich and for the witness is the
15	one who's on the hot seat.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Rich?
17	MR. RICH: An hour is fine.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. I will
19	make it 2:15, to give you time to go over the
20	documents and have your lunch.
21	(Whereupon, at 1:03 p.m., the proceedings
22	went off the record for a lunch break.)*
- 1	1

1	A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N
2	(2:21 p.m.)
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Schaeffer, are
4	you ready, sir?
5	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes, I am, Your Honor.
6	CROSS EXAMINATION (continued)
7	MR. SCHAEFFER:
8	Mr. Downey, you have before you as
9	collectively Exhibit 6X some materials which we've
10	described as excerpts from the Web pages of public
11	television stations. I'd asked you to turn to the
12	first one, WSKG.
13	JUDGE GULIN: Would it be helpful to mark
14	these 6X A through
15	MR. SCHAEFFER: Well, at the for our
16	own facilitating, it might be easier. There are
17	numbers on the bottom, right-hand corner of each, and
18	I thought I would refer to those informally so that,
19	even though it it would be easy to identify and
20	actually would waste time marking it all over again.
21	That's my thought unless somebody has a
22	different view. We'll mark the whole thing as 6X and

1	then I'll refer to the pages from the Grajeda numbers
2	
3	JUDGE DREYFUS: Okay.
4	MR. SCHAEFFER: because it will be
5	easier; they're already on there.
6	JUDGE DREYFUS: That's fine.
7	MR. SCHAEFFER: And if that gives somebody
8	any problems, we can always change it.
9	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
10	Q Would you look at the collection that's
11	marked I think it's two through eight relating to
12	WSKG.
13	Incidentally, are you acquainted with
14	WSKG?
15	A Yes.
16	Q Where is that?
17	A Binghamton, New York.
18	Q Now would you look at three in which there
19	is and just read three 500.3, I'm sorry. And
20	just look at that for a moment and I'll ask you some
21	questions about that.
22	First of all, have you are you aware of

_	whether and the service of GDD as DDG
1	whether, under the auspices of CPB or PBS or any of
2	the groups that advice the local television stations,
3	if they provide forms or suggestions on how to write
4	underwriting solicitations?
5	A Do we
6	Q Well, do you know of anybody who does that
7	other than the stations themselves?
8	A Most stations have Washington counsel that
9	they rely on for guidance and interpretation of the
10	Commission's regulations.
11	Q Is there though an organization, maybe a
12	sister organization of PBS or some other organization,
13	interested in public television who provides materials
14	to the individual stations on which they can model
15	their solicitations of underwriting?
16	A Not to my knowledge.
17	Q Now would you look at that page which we
18	designated 500.3 which you just read, and do you
19	regard the message of WSKG here as consistent with the
20	PBS guidelines?
21	A Well, the only indication here would be
22	the second paragraph where evidently announcements can
	·

1	be longer than I take from this it's a little
2	ambiguous, but evidently an announcement can be longer
3	than 15 seconds.
4	So that wouldn't comply with the PBS
5	guidelines.
6	Q Indeed, it can be as long as 60 seconds if
7	this is accurate, is that correct?
8	A Uh-huh.
9	Q Would you agree with the first paragraph
10	that as it describes underwriting?
11	A Well, I agree that the term underwriting
12	isn't exactly a familiar term to most lay people
13	outside the business, so this is an attempt to try to
14	put it in some understandable context for a business.
15	Q Have you ever read a similar expression of
16	the meaning of underwriting before or heard it?
17	A Not these no.
18	Q No?
19	Do you think it's unique to WSKG as far as
20	you know?
21	A Well, let me say that there are lots of
22	differences between public television and commercial

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

- 1	
2	Q Sure.
3	A And there are some similarities, the least
4	of which is that we both use television as a way to
5	communicate programs. Stations and PBS use or permit
6	underwriting announcements which bear some similarity
7	or resemblance to television commercials. And that is
8	a way to explain what it is. The mathematics, the
9	financial structure's entirely different; but when in
LO	Rome, you have to use you know, often use that
11	language to convey a concept to a potential
L2	underwriter that, by helping us support this program,
L3	we can identify your company on the air.
14	Q And help your business?
L5	A And that may help your business.
L6	Q And help your business sell more
L7	presumably, right?
18	A Well, if that's what your business is.
L9	Q Well, doesn't it say generally, obviously
20	because it's not to a specific underwriter, "to make
21	smart, effective use of your marketing, promotion with
22	public relations dollars both for long term

television.

1	positioning and consumer awareness?"
2	That's commercial, isn't it? Wouldn't you
3	regard that as a commercial message?
4	A It's a commercial message. But, you know,
5	we don't want by the same token, neither would we
6	want to say to a corporation you'd be wasting your
7	money to make a contribution to us. I would agree
8	with that.
9	Q Sure. Let's move on because we've got a
10	few of these.
11	Again, would you turn to 500.17, Mountain
12	Lake Channel 57. And if you'd just read that first
13	page to yourself. I don't think you have to bother
14	with more unless somebody else wants you to.
15	You would agree, would you not, that
16	that's a commercial message; that what they're saying
L7	is, the image and strength of the marketplace is a
1.8	lure to be an underwriter on Mountain Lake Channel 57?
19	MR. RICH: I'll object to the form of that
20	question.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Do you want to
22	respond?
	1

1	MR. SCHAEFFER: Seems to me there's
2	nothing wrong with the question on cross.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: It's overruled.
4	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, are you referring
5	to page one?
6	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
7	Q Page 500.17.
8	A It says, "If you would like more
9	information about"
10	Q That's right, yes.
11	And the question I said to you, isn't that
12	a solicitation based on commercial interest?
13	A Yes, it's the station inviting businesses
14	to make contact if they would like to be underwriters.
15	Q And saying that the reason for doing so is
16	it enhances your image and strength in the
17	marketplace, isn't that correct? So that's a business
18	solicitation like a commercial?
19	A I guess you could call it that.
20	Q Let's turn to 500.28, WCNY. Would you
21	read 500.28 to yourself up to the WCNY from WCNY
22	TV/WCNY II up to the that black line that stops

there. 1 2 You would agree, would you not, that that 3 is, in essence, a suggestion that the underwriting 4 announcements are commercials? 5 MR. RICH: I object and ask the Panel for 6 an interpretation of this line of questioning, namely 7 is what's being elicited this witness' understanding of what some third party wrote in these documents? He 8 has not written or sponsored any of these, and I --9 10 MR. SCHAEFFER: No. 11 MR. RICH: -- have a problem with this 12 entire line of questioning. It's mostly his interpretation of what somebody else's writing was. 13 14 MR. SCHAEFFER: The question is, this is 15 the man in charge of underwriting for PBS. And what 16 I'm trying to get -- and the suggestion has been made 17 on direct examination that underwriting by -- for 18 public television stations is essentially 19 solicitation of charitable contributions and 20 essentially a solicitation of kind of payments made 21 for the common good.

And I'm suggesting and asking isn't this

1	inconsistent with his own testimony by these two
2	stations that this is essentially a commercial a
3	suggestion that these will have commercial effect for
4	the stations, which I
5	JUDGE GULIN: But of course, the premise
6	of your question is that this is accurate. You're
7	only asking for his interpretation of this, and I
8	think that's all that Mr. Rich is saying.
9	MR. SCHAEFFER: Well, what I'm suggesting
10	I think that may be, but I don't see that that's an
11	objection to my question.
12	JUDGE GULIN: He didn't object to it.
13	MR. RICH: I was asking for a
14	clarification of what Mr. Schaeffer was seeking to
15	elicit.
16	MR. SCHAEFFER: Okay, and I'll go one step
17	first of all, let me ask two questions.
18	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
19	Q Do you regard this description of the
20	advantages of underwriting on page 500.28 as
21	consistent with the PBS guidelines of which you
22	supervise?

1	A Well, the guidelines go to editorial
2	considerations and the content of messages. Now this
3	is talking about why one should underwrite. The
4	guidelines really have nothing to do with why one
5	should underwrite.
6	This suggests that, you know, by
7	associating with a quality program, it may be
8	beneficial for your business. We try to provide a
9	reason in addition to, for example, charitable
10	deduction for a contribution, the reason the company
11	should underwrite.
12	But, as it says right here, it's to
13	increase visibility while making a valuable and much
14	needed community contribution. And that's the point
15	of this.
16	Q You think the point of this is primarily
17	to make a contribution to the community as opposed to
18	enhancing any underwriter's position in the
19	marketplace?
20	A The point of this is to fund the programs;
21	to find dollars to make programs or to make them
22	available on one's local public television station.

1	Q What is the point of advertising on a
2	commercial station? Isn't it in part to fund the
3	programs?
4	A Well, the no.
5	Q No?
6	A No, it isn't.
7	The point of the programs is to bring the
8	audience to whom to present the advertisement. And
9	the program is the bait in that case, not the benefit.
10	Q The program is the bait for the money from
11	the advertiser,
12	A Right.
13	Q is that what you're saying?
14	And are you saying
15	A No, no, no; I'm sorry.
16	It's the bait for the audience. It's to
17	get the audience to watch the program.
18	Q Mr. Downey, isn't it true that one when
19	one puts programs on the airways, one hopes to get
20	people's interest in the programs and then sells
21	advertisers on the fact that that audience will be
22	watching or hearing the program; isn't that correct?

1	MR. RICH: Ask Mr. Schaeffer if he's
2	asking this in the context of public versus commercial
3	television.
4	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'm asking him
5	JUDGE DREYFUS: He said commercial.
6	CHAIRMAN HALL: I thought I said
7	commercial, Mr. Rich.
8	MR. RICH: Sorry, I misheard.
9	MR. SCHAEFFER: Shall I repeat the
10	question?
11	MR. RICH: Please.
12	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
13	Q In commercial broadcasting, isn't the
14	function of the program to get the audience to
15	encourage the advertiser to pay?
16	A No.
17	I'm sorry, the function of the program is
18	to deliver viewers to the set; to be exposed to the
19	advertiser's advertisements and presumably then go out
20	and buy the product.
21	Q Is it your testimony that the public
22	television stations of the United States do not tailor

1	their programs to their audiences?
2	A They're tailored to the audience, yes.
3	Q And isn't it true that, on numerous
4	occasions, the tailoring of those programs to those
5	audiences are designed to get pledge money?
6	A Yes.
7	Q So how is that different than my
8	description of commercial broadcasting?
9	A Public television the purpose is
LO	lies in the program and the service it provides to the
L1	community. As I said before, the objective isn't
L2	necessarily to attract every viewer or, you know,
L3	uniformly a large number of viewers; the focus is on
L4	the content of the programs.
L5	Q Doesn't that depend on the program? For
L6	example, in the month of March, there are pledge weeks
L7	throughout the United States, aren't there?
L8	A There are.
L9	Q Aren't those pledge weeks designed to get
20	money for the stations?
21	A They're designed to appeal to segments of
22	the population that aren't ordinarily members to bring

1	
2	Q And so by don't they do that don't
3	the stations do that by regulating the content?
4	A Yes, they regulate the content to
5	encourage people to become members of the station.
6	Q So in effect, they put on programs which
7	will get more likely to get people to pay money,
8	right?
9	A To make a voluntary contribution to the
10	station.
11	Q All right. Now let me ask you another
12	question.
13	Advertisers put on programs to get
14	audiences radio and television stations in the
15	commercial field, do they not, put on programs that
16	will attract audiences and therefore so that they can
17	sell that time to advertisers, isn't that correct?
18	A Agree with that.
19	Q There is no fundamental difference between
20	that and pledge week, is there, except that the payers
21	in the case of the public television is the audience?
22	A Well. I don't follow the last part, but

1	Q Well, you just told me that the purpose of
2	pledge week is to get in people who would not
3	ordinarily watch public television and ante up money
4	for the privilege of watching. Isn't that true?
5	A That's the purpose of some of the programs
6	in pledge week. We also run, you know, our regular
7	programming during pledge weeks.
8	Q Okay. That's essentially a commercial
9	enterprise, isn't it? You're trying to tailor your
10	programs to achieve a monetary return?
11	A I'm just I'm not comfortable with
12	tagging it as a commercial enterprise. You know
13	Q So is whether or not
14	A to do the best job you can either
15	making or acquiring a program to demonstrate the
16	nature of what public broadcasting is about in hopes
17	of gaining, you know, again, a voluntary contribution
18	from a member of the public because they believe in
19	what we're doing.
20	Now, if that's a commercial enterprise
21	you know, I just can't I just don't agree with that
22	analysis.

1	Q Don't you put certain entertainment on
2	such as Riverdance which will appeal to people and
3	encourage them to pay money?
4	A We put it on because we think it is a
5	quality program probably not available elsewhere
6	that's representative of the kind of programming that
7	PBS provides. We say in the pledge breaks around it
8	this is the kind of programming you can find here.
9	If you believe in you know, this is a
10	worthwhile program, then you'll contribute to help us
11	bring more worthwhile programs.
12	Q Would you dispute that there's a higher
13	concentration of music during pledge week than any
14	other time?
15	A I guess I would say there's more music
16	during pledge week than other times, yes.
17	Q And aren't you didn't you just tell us
18	that the purpose of pledge week is to promise the
19	viewers that they would see more programs such as they
20	are now seeing in order to encourage them to put in
21	their money?
22	A Well we try to put on special you

1	know, what I'll call special programs that attract a
2	high degree of attention that may involve, you know,
3	celebrities or, you know, well-known performers that,
4	you know, you might not see at some other time of the
5	year, and a good proportion of those turn out to be
6	music programs.
7	Q I thought you said that the motive for the
8	pledge payment was supposed to be that this is the
9	kind of program you would see on public television if
10	you will support public television?
11	A Well, by kind of programming, quality
12	programming.
13	Q Well, but if you put on more quality music
14	in order to obtain pledges, isn't that an implicit
15	promise that, in the future, there will be more music
16	on public television?
17	A Yeah, I think you have to be careful
18	painting, you know, this black and white. It's not to
19	suggest there is no music any other time of the year.
20	There may be a concentration of music performance
21	programs during pledge, but it's not to suggest they
22	aren't on at any other time of the year.

1	Q Well, we'll get on to pledges in a minute.
2	Let me move on.
3	MR. SCHAEFFER: I have a proposal which I
4	think may be more practical in this. Rather than take
5	the witness through each one of these, and there are
6	20 of them I mean, I can ask the same questions,
7	whether or not they are consistent with PBS guidelines
8	and the like.
9	I would offer them in as evidence at this
10	time again, these particular ones and see if we
11	can avoid the cross examination. Mr. Rich has not
12	agreed this is one of the areas Mr. Rich has not
13	agreed should go in evidence, and I would just, to
14	save time, ask that we put it in for whatever it's
15	worth.
16	JUDGE GULIN: Okay, be precise. They're
17	already in evidence, but
18	MR. SCHAEFFER: He's made a motion to
19	strike.
20	JUDGE GULIN: You want us to make a ruling
21	with respect to these documents?
22	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes, and save some time.

1	For whatever you think these documents are worth.
2	There are 20 of them 20 or so. Different stations.
3	Each one of them, you will see, has similar set ups.
4	And we submit that, on their face, they
5	really are in the nature of solicitations for
6	commercials.
7	MR. RICH: If I may, Your Honors, without
8	unduly repeating arguments that have been made, rule
9	251.43(e) provides that no evidence, including
10	exhibits, may be submitted in the written direct case
11	without a sponsoring witness.
12	The only purported sponsoring witness for
13	these documents is an employee of White & Case who
14	testified that her only knowledge concerning them was
15	that she found them on a Web site.
16	I don't believe that's adequate basis for
17	documents coming in for any probative value beyond,
18	again, whatever testimony Mr. Schaeffer wishes to
19	elicit concerning them of relevance to this case
20	through one or more witnesses on the stand.
21	Again, it seems to me we have a proceeding
22	where I can put a paralegal on the stand, push a few

1 buttons on the Internet and throw in a whole bunch of 2 junk saying we have a sponsoring witness. 3 I'm inclined now to do that on rebuttal case. 4 The difference is, 5 SCHAEFFER: it 6 wouldn't be relevant. 7 This CARP, under 251.43(e), says that in the case -- no evidence, including exhibits, may be 8 submitted in the written direct without a sponsoring 9 10 witness at all except where the CARP Panel has taken 11 notice, or in the case of incorporation by reference 12 or past records, or for good cause shown. 13 And it seems to me that what we have 14 established -- maybe this is unusual for a CARP. 15 have taken what actually is very good evidence, the 16 local stations' own material, and tried to put it in 17 front of you. 18 And if -- I'm not quite clear what a 19 sponsoring witness is. I still don't exactly 20 understand it. But it seems to me, in the interest of 21 advancing this proceeding, that we should put this 22 material in evidence.

1	If Mr. Rich has some objection that it's
2	phony or fraudulent, he I mean, I don't think he's
3	saying that. He can easily call any one of the
4	stations and have it. They're his clients ultimately.
5	But it seems to me that this is goes
6	right to the heart of the issue. These are the local
7	stations making solicitations of in effect, what it
8	amounts to is commercials.
9	JUDGE GULIN: Let me ask you something,
10	Mr. Schaeffer. Do you plan on putting on a rebuttal
11	case?
12	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes, I do; but I don't
13	know that I would not ordinarily put on a rebuttal
14	case as the I don't think as to underwriting
15	because unless it's to some of the numbers that
16	went on this morning, which I think were incorrect.
17	But the question would be anybody I put on
18	who's an individual as a sponsoring witness is
19	feigning. Because the reality is, we got this
20	material from the stations themselves, and what's the
21	point of doing that?

I put somebody on who authenticated.

1	don't know what sponsoring witness is. When a party
2	makes an admission of this kind, what more can you do?
3	JUDGE DREYFUS: Well, Mr. Schaeffer, I
4	think not everything on the Internet is accurate.
5	MR. SCHAEFFER: Somebody just suggested to
6	me that
7	JUDGE DREYFUS: Excuse me.
8	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'm sorry.
9	JUDGE DREYFUS: Not everything on the
10	Internet is accurate, number one. Number two, for
11	example, if it's talking about 60 second spots,
12	doesn't mean to me yet that if someone tried to place
13	an ad for a 60 second spot that that would be accepted
14	even though it's here on the Internet.
15	And the reason is, sometimes mistakes are
16	made.
17	MR. SCHAEFFER: Well
18	JUDGE DREYFUS: And that this might be a
19	mistake. And unless you show us someone who did place
20	a 60 second spot that got on and was broadcast that
21	way, I don't accept this as absolute proof or
22	admission against interest with respect to the 60

second spot -- this in and of itself. 1 2 MR. SCHAEFFER: I have to say, Judge 3 Dreyfus, I don't understand that. This is -- when somebody says -- first of all, insofar as something 4 5 being -- you can get a lot of things off the Internet, nobody has suggested realistically that somebody is 6 7 impersonating any of these stations. So that I don't understand how it could be 8 9 false on the Internet. 10 With respect to the second issue, I don't 11 know if they got 60 second spots or not or 30 second 12 spots or 15 second spots. I only know they are 13 offering to the businessmen in their community on the Web site the opportunity to make 60 second spots. 14 15 I think that's what goes to the issue. 16 What goes to the issue is they are soliciting. Maybe 17 they're successful in soliciting and maybe they're 18 not, but I don't understand that it's incumbent on me 19 to show that -- the fact that they're soliciting, to show that the solicitation is accepted. 20 21 That would put a burden on me that's 22 impossible.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: What you're asking
2	us to do, Mr. Schaeffer, is to accept these documents,
3	to read them; and as you say, give them such weight.
4	MR. SCHAEFFER: That would be fine.
5	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: However, you want
6	us to give them the weight to show that the
7	underwriting is indeed comparable to commercial
8	advertising.
9	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes, and it speaks for
10	the documents really speak for themselves.
11	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: I understand.
12	JUDGE GULIN: If I may are you
13	finished? I'm sorry.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Yes.
15	JUDGE GULIN: I agree with elements of
16	both arguments here. I think there is a problem that
17	there's no sponsoring witness for these documents. I
18	don't think this is the proper sponsoring witness.
19	It would have been very easy for you
20	so, in some sense, we're talking about technicalities
20	so, in some sense, we're talking about technicalities here because these could have been put in your direct

Which is why I was hoping that this would 1 2 be worked out between counsel because, to some extent, 3 it's a technical problem. The idea of sponsorship is 4 a somewhat nebulous concept, I agree. It's nowhere defined in the rules. 5 6 But as I thought we indicated, it has 7 something to do with an appropriate witness connecting the documents -- they've already been authenticated, 8 9 I think, adequately by Ms. Grajeda. She took them off 10 the Internet. 11 It's true they may not be -- we have no 12 guarantee that they're accurate, but we'll simply take 13 it as your evidence. We can always have rebuttal evidence if they're not accurate. 14 15 guess what I'm saying is why 16 couldn't you do this on rebuttal? Have a proper 17 sponsoring witness to put this in on rebuttal and they'll come in. 18 19 MR. SCHAEFFER: But what would he -- what All I can do is get 20 would the witness sponsor? somebody like Mr. Ledbetter, for example, who will 21

come and say I've read all of these documents and then

he would summarize them. 1 2 There's no sponsor -- usually when you think -- I don't know what was meant by sponsoring 3 4 witness. I can understand what it means in the case 5 of third party admissions, an authenticating witness. 6 But I don't understand what it means to sponsor -- and, as I say, I'm trying to deal with 7 substance and justice here. 8 I welcome -- I have no 9 idea who could sponsor this. 10 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Well, it's someone 11 who actually produces the material, who 12 knowledge of the material and who can be cross 13 examined concerning the material. 14 MR. SCHAEFFER: But I can't do that 15 because I can't subpoena them and I can't speak 16 directly to them. Mr. Rich has made that eminently 17 clear. So that -- how can I do this? 18 Well, what about a witness JUDGE GULIN: 19 who opines that there is no difference essentially 20 between commercial advertising and public broadcasting 21 sponsorship? Now, it's -- I understand that to you 22 that seems like a very minor technicality to have

someone come on the stand and say that, and that 1 2 person being a proper sponsor. In my mind, that person will be a proper 3 4 sponsor because they've established the nexus between 5 these documents and his opinion. And I think that was 6 -- that's probably all that was envisioned by the rule 7 requiring sponsorship to avoid tons of documents being dumped 8 in without the Panel really case 9 understanding why and having to wade through them all. 10 MR. SCHAEFFER: Well --11 JUDGE GULIN: So what would prevent you 12 from doing that? 13 MR. SCHAEFFER: Nothing prevents me except 14 the very reason that you're giving me is it's a pure 15 technicality. 16 JUDGE GULIN: Yes, it's pure 17 technicality. 18 MR. SCHAEFFER: You have the discretion. 19 I don't really understand -- it's not a common law 20 court even. And in the regular courts, when you have 21 a technicality of that kind, what's the point? 22 had discovery, I could simply serve notice to admit

and I'd be finished with the darn thing. 1 2 But it seems to me to protract this 3 hearing while I get some paid expert, which is what it 4 will be, who will get on the stand and say gee, this is a lot like what we do in radio -- I can do it. 5 6 Sure, I can do it. But it seems to me senseless because, in the end, you don't care about 7 8 what that paid witness says; you're going to read 9 And that's why I say I appeal to the Panel 10 that this is kind of common law gobbledygook. 11 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Well, the 12 difficulty we have is Mr. Rich objects to your doing 13 it this way. 14 MR. SCHAEFFER: You have the ability, as 15 I understand it, under the rules, where there is good 16 cause, to waive the sponsoring witness requirement. I respectfully submit that this is such a case. 17 18 Usually you do not get cases, am 19 informed by people who are more experienced in this area than I am, of third party admissions. 20 21 you don't get this kind of issue where we're trying to show that there has been a seed change or a different 22

2 because we don't have discovery ability and we don't 3 have the ability to subpoena. 4 And therefore, I would respectfully 5 request, rather than make me go through the really 6 folderol of getting in a paid expert who will say yes, 7 it looks a lot to me like paid commercials, which is 8 the same thing you're going to decide, and your 9 decision is far more important than the paid experts, 10 that we simply waive the -- say there's good cause 11 here to go ahead with this and leave Mr. Poor Downey 12 and me to go on to a more fruitful area. 13 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Do you have any 14 response, Mr. Rich? 15 MR. RICH: We all have frustrations about 16 these rules. I'm not going to rehearse mу 17 frustrations, including getting some simple data out 18 of ASCAP and BMI to which I gather that at least one 19 of the parties will be objecting, and conceivably 20 tomorrow in their papers. 2.1 So I don't think the issue is what's fair 22 or not fair. We live with the rules as they exist

natured in an institution and where we are limited

I think it's terribly unfair to, in essence, 1 2 shift the burden to PBS, put into evidence and proffer hundreds of documents, and then Mr. Schaeffer to say 3 well, Mr. Rich can call witnesses to rebut all this. 4 5 That's not the presumption of the rules as 6 I understand them. The presumption is the sponsoring 7 party has to proffer a witness that makes the kind of connection to which you refer that allows cross 8 9 examination of questions such as Judge Dreyfus has 10 about the reliability of the documents and what 11 they're worth as opposed to shifting the burden onto 12 me by dumping a truckload of documents onto our client 13 and then say you can put on people on the rebuttal case from all over the country if you want to. 14 15 I don't think that's the spirit of the 16 rules. 1.7 JUDGE GULIN: Well, then in your view of 18 sponsorship, it would actually require an official 19 from the stations to sponsor the documents. 20 think that's what was envisioned? 21 MR. RICH: I think --22 JUDGE GULIN: Who else could authenticate

Т.	a document in that manner?
2	MR. RICH: Well, I think that there's no
3	guarantee that any piece of evidence that somebody
4	wants to put in in a proceeding comes in other than
5	through the normal techniques of somebody who has some
6	information on which the Panel can rely.
7	Yes, I would say that the most
8	knowledgeable people about this are representatives of
9	the authors, the stations themselves. That, to me, is
10	self-evident.
11	The fact that it may be frustrating to a
12	party not to have available to them because of the
13	limited compulsory process provisions for witnesses is
14	a frustration which I share in similar fashion.
15	I've been foreclosed from discovery in
16	this case that I very much wanted to have in.
17	JUDGE GULIN: And in this type of an
18	administrative proceeding, under your view, this type
19	of evidence can never come in unless they're somehow
20	able to convince a station official to testify?
21	MR. RICH: Well, they've been quite
22	successful in getting people they claim to be experts

to testify to the very sorts of propositions, Judge Gulin, you suggested might have satisfied your concern.

That was the essence of the Day and Ledbetter testimony as I heard it saying that it's very similar. At a level of generality, fine; but I would submit that's very different than taking in as punitive admissions, you know, offers on a Web site done by who knows what level of station management or sales force; you know, reaching out there -- subject to when these messages come in, what really happened when they get ground up against the FCC rules, against the internal station guidelines, against the kind of internal checks and balances.

We have no idea. It's just an advertising

-- set of advertising solicitations over a Web site

and of terribly little probative value. And I think

the prejudice to us of putting them in without some

better sense of their reliability or what they really

reflect in real practice outweighs the probative value

of this material.

I mean, we're all frustrated by the

NEALR. GROSS

2.1

process here. There's no doubt about it.

MR. SCHAEFFER: It's a catch-22. And one particularly inappropriate, as I see it, and something that's denominated in arbitration. Because the purpose of arbitration is to get to the heart of the matter as inexpensively and reasonably as possible.

Here what we're getting as suggestion is that we have this complicated system which should -- you know, it frustrates the workings of the Arbitration Panel in considering things. Tough. The practice overcomes the substance.

What you have here is you can read the uniformity of these solicitations, what it is overall. But nobody is better than you to read that, to understand it. And I just don't understand why, other than -- it seems to me a sponsoring witness must be different in different contexts.

Where you're dealing with third party witnesses, I don't see why, since the rules don't say that, a sponsoring witness is any more than authentication of what a third party said. It is for you to determine whether this is relevant.

1	When Mr. Rich says we're dumping lots of
2	stuff on you, what I'm now doing is giving you
3	material which I think is highly relevant to what the
4	local stations are doing in soliciting underwriting.
5	I've authenticated it through Ms. Grajeda.
6	Why that is more of a sponsorship, I don't
7	know. I could understand if I had a statistical study
8	and I just dumped that on you and I didn't have a
9	sponsoring witness. But when you had admissions and
10	facts of this kind, which are obviously relevant, it
11	seems to me sponsorship and I would ask you to
12	reconsider that.
13	Sponsorship can mean no more than
14	that's what the third party said. Are all witnesses
15	here to be non-fact witnesses?
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Kleinberg, do
17	you have any comment, sir?
18	MR. KLEINBERG: Yeah, I do, Judge.
19	We cannot lose sight of the fact that the
20	punitive authors of these documents are the parties.
21	Mr. Schaeffer calls them third parties. They aren't
22	third parties. They are the parties to this

proceeding. 1 2 They aren't calling them. We can't call 3 them. Literally we can't call them up. Ethically we 4 can't call them up. We can't subpoena them. The 5 records are sitting there, and now we're told they may 6 not be accurate. 7 Well, I mean, there has to be some good faith basis to suggest that these things aren't what 8 9 they appear on their face to be. And they appear on 10 their face to be -- and the fact that there are 11 hundreds of them I think gives credibility to the 12 notion that they appear to be what they are, which is 13 efforts on the part of all of the applicant stations to obtain advertising, underwriting. 14 15 Call it whatever you like. We know what the issue here is and we're all talking about it. And 16 we know clearly what the issue is. 17 18 CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right, give us just a minute. 19 20 MR. RICH: If I may just make a final 21 comment responsive to Mr. Kleinberg.

The stations are not parties to this

22

1	proceeding. We are not counsel to 350 public
2	television stations. We are counsel for the Public
3	Broadcasting Service. We are counsel for National
4	Public Radio. We are counsel for the Corporation for
5	Public Broadcasting.
6	They have been the signatories to the
7	agreements. They have tendered the payments for the
8	societies on behalf of and in lieu of individual
9	payment from the individual stations.
10	We are not counsel to the individual
11	stations.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
13	MR. SCHAEFFER: I have just two and I'm
14	sorry for belaboring it.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
16	MR. SCHAEFFER: One, it's pointed out to
17	me that in subdivision (k) of 251.4.47 it says,
18	"However, upon leave from the Panel, the document may
19	be admitted as evidence without a sponsoring witness
20	if official notice is proper or, if in the Panel's
21	view, the cross examined witness is the proper
22	sponsoring witness."

1	Now in addition to that, I'm looking at
2	Ms. Jameson's testimony which is in front of us, and
3	it says "PBS and NPR are proposing a rate adjustment
4	in the total amount of compulsory license fees, etc."
5	PBS and NPR are thus acting in this
6	proceeding on behalf of all such noncommercial
7	broadcasters, and we have structured our presentations
8	accordingly. So we they are parties. They are
9	acting in a representative capacity.
10	Ms. Jameson herself, in testimony that
11	undoubtedly was approved by Mr. Rich's firm, has said
12	so. And there's no dispute about it.
12	so. And there's no dispute about it. CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Okay, thank you.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Okay, thank you.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Okay, thank you. All right, just a moment. Judge Gulin is
13 14 15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Okay, thank you. All right, just a moment. Judge Gulin is going to make our ruling.
13 14 15 16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Okay, thank you. All right, just a moment. Judge Gulin is going to make our ruling. JUDGE GULIN: All right, obviously, as
13 14 15 16 17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Okay, thank you. All right, just a moment. Judge Gulin is going to make our ruling. JUDGE GULIN: All right, obviously, as we've been saying, there has to be a sponsoring
13 14 15 16 17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Okay, thank you. All right, just a moment. Judge Gulin is going to make our ruling. JUDGE GULIN: All right, obviously, as we've been saying, there has to be a sponsoring witness for these documents. There has not been a
13 14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Okay, thank you. All right, just a moment. Judge Gulin is going to make our ruling. JUDGE GULIN: All right, obviously, as we've been saying, there has to be a sponsoring witness for these documents. There has not been a proper sponsoring witness up until now, so our

sponsoring witness. 1 2 choices. Those are our three And obviously -- we obviously can't take official notice 3 4 of these documents. So either we're going to strike 5 the documents from the record or find that Mr. Downey 6 is an appropriate sponsoring witness. 7 It's a very close question to us as to whether Mr. Downey is a sponsoring witness within the 8 9 meaning of the rule. But we're also mindful that this 10 is a technical matter to a great degree. These 11 documents can easily be put into evidence with another 12 witness on rebuttal.

And we're mindful of Mr. Schaeffer's point that it would almost be an exercise of -- that's just not necessary. So we're inclined to rule that these documents will come into evidence and Mr. Downey will be a sponsoring witness for these documents.

So as to the documents before us, 6X, the motion to strike is denied.

MR. SCHAEFFER: Your Honors, I will now -I'm not going to pursue this any further with Mr.
Downey because I think I'm just wasting our time. And

NEAL R. GROSS

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	maybe Mr. Kleinberg has a different view and maybe Mr.
2	Rich does.
3	But let me move on because the hour is
4	growing older. I'm going to skip some of the material
5	that I had and go to another
6	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
7	Q You mentioned a show called Wishbone. Now
8	you've in your direct testimony you wrote, Mr.
9	Downey, "If a public television if public
10	television operated like a commercial broadcaster,
11	many of these programs simply would not see the light
12	of day."
13	Do you recall doing that?
14	A Yes.
15	Q Okay. And that's at page eight.
16	Now I'm going to address your attention to
17	Wishbone. Wishbone is an award winning children's
18	literary series, is it not?
19	A Yes.
20	Q It's won an Emmy?
21	A I'm not confident of that.
22	Q Well
- 1	

1	A Certainly it's a children's programming
2	Q You would agree, would you not how many
3	years has it been running on PBS?
4	A I believe it's been running about two
5	years.
6	Q And it has
7	A Three.
8	Q been highly acclaimed?
9	A Yes.
10	Q In essence, I believe it's a story about
11	a terrier who dresses up as literary figures,
12	A Yes.
13	Q or something along those lines?
14	It is a fact, is it not, that it was
15	scheduled to be canceled in 1996?
16	A Not to my knowledge.
17	Q Well, I'm going to show you a newspaper
18	article. Maybe that will I believe that will
19	refresh your recollection for that.
20	MR. SCHAEFFER: Would you show 713.55 to
21	Mr. Downey and to Mr. Rich and the Panel?
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: The ASCAP Exhibit

1	7X?
2	MR. SCHAEFFER: 7X; yes, Your Honor.
3	(Whereupon, the above-mentioned
4	document was marked as ASCAP
5	Exhibit 7X for identification.)
6	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
7	Q Would you just read that to yourself?
8	I see you've finished reading it. Does
9	that refresh your recollection that Wishbone was
10	sentenced to death, so to speak?
11	A That's an incorrect characterization.
12	Q Okay, well tell me what you do recall.
13	A Like any program, it takes money to
14	produce it. The money has to be found. An initial
15	batch of 40 episodes was produced. The producers have
16	come to PBS seeking funding to produce additional
17	episodes.
18	And to date, we have not agreed to provide
19	that funding. Now that is not to say, however, that
20	the series has been canceled. We have just not, so
21	far, elected to invest PBS funds in its continuation.
22	Moreover, were the producers to find

1	funding from the third party sources, thus not you
2	know, eliminating the need for PBS funding, then it
3	would definitely continue on PBS.
4	Q Are you acquainted with a Kathy Quattrone,
5	Q-u-a-t-t-r-o-n-e?
6	A Yes.
7	Q Who is she?
8	A She's the senior programming official at
9	PBS.
10	Q All right.
11	MR. SCHAEFFER: And would you produce to
12	we're not putting that in evidence yet. I'm not
13	offering it. I don't know that it's necessary.
14	Would you give the Panel our next exhibit
15	for identification which is 7
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: 8X.
17	MR. SCHAEFFER: Which is a copy of page
18	seven of <u>Current</u> for January 19, 1998.
19	(Whereupon, the above-mentioned
20	document was marked as ASCAP
21	Exhibit 8X for identification.)
22	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:

1	Q And would you look particularly you can
2	read the whole thing if you want to, Mr. Downey, but
3	if you'd look in the first column, the third
4	paragraph, I think it is, where it starts with the
5	word "topping the good news."
6	And let me know when you're finished
7	reading it.
8	A Yes.
9	Q Do you know now or did you ever know that,
10	in fact, Wishbone had been, in effect, saved by Chuck
11	E Cheese and 7-11, or is that not known to you before?
12	MR. RICH: Object to the form.
13	THE WITNESS: The producers of Wishbone
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Wait just a minute,
15	please.
16	Do you want to respond?
17	MR. SCHAEFFER: No, I
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Okay.
19	The objection's sustained.
20	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
21	Q Are you aware of the fact that Wishbone
22	has been is now being the subject of underwritings

1	by Chuck E Cheese and 7-11?
2	A I'm aware that they're underwriters, yes.
3	Q Is that from the article or does this just
4	remind you of it?
5	A I was aware of that.
6	Q Okay. Is it fair to say that, but for the
7	underwriters, that if no other underwriters had come
8	forward, Wishbone would not have been continued on
9	PBS?
10	A As I said before, the producers Big
11	Feets Productions provided 40 episodes of Wishbone to
12	PBS. We contributed to that production cost. It was
13	in large measure deficit financed by the producers.
14	What we acquired from the producers is the
15	right to show the program for some number of years.
16	Heretofore, until the time of this announcement, there
L7	had been no underwriting secured for that program. At
18	this point, underwriting was secured.
19	But the underwriting goes to that first 40
20	episodes, not any subsequent set of episodes. So when
21	you talk about canceling Wishbone, Wishbone will end
22	when its rights end unless there are more episodes

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

produced. 1 2 In order to produce more episodes, either 3 PBS has to come up with the money or some additional or other set of underwriters has to come up with the 4 5 That hasn't happened yet. money. What this article again refers to was 6 7 underwriters found who were added -- whose names were put onto the first 40 episodes which are presently in 8 distribution on PBS. And those funds flowed to the 9 10 producer to help mitigate their multi-million dollar deficit. 11 12 But again, that's recovering, you know, production deficit for the first series. It's not --13 hasn't to do with a second series. 14 15 Q Is it your testimony that not -- that if 16 you had not achieved these underwriters, that Wishbone 17 would have continued? 18 Α The first block of the -- the block of 40 episodes will continue on PBS until the rights expire, 19 20 notwithstanding the outcome of any underwriting efforts. 21 22 The other day, some -- now is it -- I

1	believe it was your direct testimony also that, but
2	for public television, viewers of certain types of
3	program and particularly children's program would not
4	withdrawn; that's not right.
5	You testified, I believe, that, at a time
6	of great debate over some of the programming found on
7	commercial television including cable, public
8	television is striving. Viewers depend on public
9	television for certain types of programming they
10	cannot attain anywhere else whether their particular
11	interest is public television's children line up or
12	other things.
13	Now, in fact, isn't it true that cable and
14	commercial television are now providing similar fare
15	in many respects which is precisely the reason that so
16	many stations seek to convert underwritings to
17	commercials, and this is particularly true as to
18	children's television?
19	MR. RICH: I would object.
20	JUDGE GULIN: I lost sight of the
21	question.
22	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Rephrase the

1	question.
2	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
3	Q Isn't it let's put it another way.
4	Isn't it true that, at the present time,
5	cable television and also network television is
6	providing children's fare equal in quality to the
7	children's fare that is on public television?
8	A I don't accept that, no.
9	Q Are you acquainted with Ms. Alice Cahn,
10	C-a-h-n?
11	A Yes.
12	Q Who is she?
13	A Alice is in charge of children's
14	programming for PBS.
15	Q Now I'm going to show you a copy of an
16	article which appeared in The New York Times on March
17	25, 1998.
18	MR. SCHAEFFER: Would you show that to the
19	Panel? And we'll offer that as we'll just identify
20	that as 9X.
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: 9X, ASCAP 9X.
22	(Whereupon, the above-mentioned
i	II

1	document was marked as ASCAP
2	Exhibit 9X for identification.)
3	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
4	Q Have you seen this article before?
5	A No, I haven't.
6	Q Are you aware that apparently an
7	educational show for preschoolers on Nickelodeon
8	called Blue's Clues is now drawing more viewers each
9	week than Sesame Street?
10	A I'm aware of Blue's Clues, yes.
11	Q Now Ms. Cahn is quoted as saying the
12	following: "We're seeing a paradigm shift" this is
13	in the second column of the first page.
14	"'We're seeing a paradigm shift where
15	people realize that it's not only on public television
16	that you can find quality children's programming,'
17	said Alice Cahn, director for children's programming
18	at PBS. She just signed another four year contract
19	with Children's Workshop Children's Television
20	Workshop, producers of Sesame Street, which is now in
21	its 29th season.
22	"'I also think we have a generation of

1	parents who grew up with a comfortable feeling about
2	television that our parents didn't have and, frankly,
3	that I didn't have raising mine,' said Ms. Cahn, whose
4	child is now 18.
5	"'They have a willingness to shop around
6	on television and see what's there.' She also admires
7	Blue's Clues, as does Peggy Charren, children's
8	programming activist."
9	Now, do you have any reason to believe
10	that Alice Cahn did not say what is described in this
11	article?
12	A I'd like to point out you asked me whether
13	I thought there were channels that children's
14	channels on cable that provided programming that is
15	equal or greater quality to PBS. I think Blue's Clues
16	is a terrific program, but it's only one program.
17	That doesn't make a channel.
18	Q Would you agree with Ms. Cahn that we're
19	seeing a paradigm shift where people realize that it's
20	not only on public television that you can find
21	quality children's programming?
22	A We are seeing well, Nickelodeon has

1	been on, you know, for ten years or more. And some of
2	its programs are quite good. Does that make a
3	paradigm shift? I'm not sure I agree with Alice on
4	that.
5	Q But you do agree, do you not, that
6	Nickelodeon is now showing, among others, first
7	quality children's television?
8	A I do agree that Blue's Clues is a superb
9	program and it's on Nickelodeon. Nickelodeon has some
10	other programs that I think are not very good.
11	Q And do they have some others that you
12	think are good?
13	A I think I just said that.
14	Q No, besides Blue's
15	A That's the only program that comes to mind
16	on Nickelodeon that I would think is of a par or of a
17	quality comparable to what's found on public
18	television.
19	Q Are there other shows such as Bill Nye
20	which are on other children's channels or other
21	children's television?
22	A Bill Nye appears on commercial television

1	broadcast, but it doesn't appear on cable.
2	Q All right. And is that a good children's
3	show?
4	A Yes, I think so.
5	Q And what about The Magic Schoolbus; where
6	is that carried?
7	A Magic Schoolbus was formerly I guess it
8	actually still is on PBS, but either just has or soon
9	will migrate I'm not sure.
10	Q To Fox?
11	A Yes, you're right; thank you, Fox.
12	Q So isn't it a fact that, in recent years,
13	there have been an increase in high quality children's
14	educational programs children's television programs
15	in part perhaps by the stimulation of public
16	television?
17	A Well, there's a lot of things going on.
18	You know, the Commission has imposed the three hour
19	rule which means commercial networks have to run three
20	hours of children's programming a week which accounts
21	for the migration of Scholastic.
22	That was a public television program that

1	migrated to commercial television.
2	Q So that would it be fair to say that there
3	is a trend in the commercial side, both cable, network
4	and perhaps even local television, to start putting on
5	children's programming perhaps stimulated by the FCC
6	and certainly stimulated by public television's good
7	example?
8	A There has been a trend of some programs
9	migrating from public television and some programs
10	being created by commercial television in response to
11	a regulatory requirement.
12	There's been you know, I mean, the
13	basic cable is made up of program services, many of
14	which emulate aspects of public television.
15	Q You understand, do you not, that the fees
16	being set by this CARP are based on what is going to
17	happen in the next five years they're anticipatory,
18	not perspective do you not?
19	A I understand that.
20	Q So it's your testimony, is it not, that
21	there are trends in the television marketplace which
22	provide alternative children's educational

1	programming? You just said I think that cable is
2	becoming increasingly as encroaching on public
3	television's fare, is that correct?
4	A No, I said there are among basic cable,
5	there are channels that many channels that emulate
6	certain aspects of public television.
7	Q So there is, for the viewer, an increasing
8	menu by virtue of cable, the FCC and economic
9	circumstances to and by virtue of that increased
10	menu, many of the things that were formerly only seen
11	on public television are now seen outside of public
12	television, isn't that true?
13	A Because of basic cable, there are many
14	things that were formerly available only on public
15	television that are now available in other venues.
16	But I'm speaking again on genres of programming, not
17	necessarily rising to the quality level of PBS
18	programming.
19	Q And in fact, as a consequence of that,
20	doesn't it make it somewhat more important for public
21	television to satisfy potential underwriters to pick
22	up the tab for its existing and future programming?

1	A Well, in the first place, the amount of
2	underwriting in children's programming is very little.
3	It's, I think, around three million out of 70 million.
4	Q I'm talking about, generally speaking, the
5	fare that's on public withdrawn. Let me ask the
6	question in a different way.
7	Isn't it a fact that underwriting dollars
8	are now I'll come back to this. I'll come back to
9	this. Let's move on to we'll get that at the
10	station equity level.
11	Would you dispute that public television
12	sources of revenue increasingly depend on member
13	subscriptions and underwriters' payments?
14	A Well, I guess I would have to dispute
15	that, yes.
16	For example, the Federal appropriation is
17	rising. It's risen from \$250 to \$300 million. So
18	there's an example of I mean, the implication of
19	your question is, is that the only source of income
20	that's rising, and the answer is no.
21	Q Would is it your tell us about the
22	increase in Federal funding.

1	A Well, funds are appropriated annually
2	which flow to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.
3	And I believe this is not my area of expertise, but
4	the appropriation has risen, as I said, from I think
5	\$250 to \$300 million between fiscal 1999 and fiscal
6	2000.
7	Q So that Congress is not cutting the
8	appropriations in the future for public television or
9	public broadcasting, is that correct?
10	A I can only Congress deals with this one
11	year at a time.
12	Q Yes, I understand.
13	A If I could predict the future of what
14	Congress is going to do, I'd be in another business.
15	So, for the coming year, it is projected
16	to rise, but there's been no appropriation beyond
17	that.
18	Q Well, it's more likely that if you have
19	the what's happened is an authorization as opposed
20	to an appropriation?
21	A Now I'm in trouble.
22	Q Yeah.

1	A I'm not sure of where we are in the
2	Q Well, what's your basis for saying that
3	the Congress is increasing its likely expenditures for
4	public broadcasting?
5	A Well, I'm sorry; it is the \$300
6	million, to the best of my knowledge, is an
7	appropriation. I mean, that has been voted on by the
8	Congress. It is now in the law.
9	Q So that
10	A So that is an increase from the present
11	year.
12	Q And so given that, we anticipate that over
13	the next five years, there's no reason to believe
14	there will be a diminution in Federal support for
15	public broadcasting, is that correct?
16	A I can't agree to that. You know, two
17	years ago, the Speaker of the House was talking or
18	three years ago zeroing out public broadcasting.
19	We live in a fast changing environment.
20	Now in the short term, that is for the
21	next year, there's a rise an increase in Federal
22	funding, but I can't speak to what happens beyond

1	that.
2	Q Now if, on the other hand, there had been
3	a decrease in funding, wouldn't you be telling this
4	Panel at the present time that the trend in the future
5	is less Federal funds?
6	A Well,
7	MR. RICH: Objection.
8	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: The objection is
9	sustained.
10	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
11	Q In making in taking the positions that
12	public television does in this proceeding, don't you
13	base your analysis on what you know is going to happen
14	in the next five years or think is going to happen in
15	the next five years?
16	A The best I can respond is to say, you
17	know, looking at what's happened over the past five
18	years, knowing what I know about the environment, I'm
19	not expecting dramatic changes in the coming five
20	years.
21	There is an increase in the Federal
22	appropriation, but some of these, you know, sources

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

-	nave been decreasing, in particular support from
2	corporations.
3	Q There is already, I believe, in evidence
4	Exhibit 301 which is the 1996 annual report of the
5	Corporation for Public Broadcasting. And I've asked
6	that it be distributed. We also have some colored
7	we have colored we have taken the actual colors and
8	we should give that because it's easier to see.
9	JUDGE GULIN: That's the what, the 19
10	MR. SCHAEFFER: The 1996 Corporation for
11	Public Broadcasting report. I don't think you have it
12	in that batch. It's entitled Comes Down to the Future
13	and How We're To Pay For It. They are ASCAP Exhibit
14	301.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Filed with your
16	direct case?
17	MR. SCHAEFFER: This is page 17 of the
18	report.
19	JUDGE GULIN: And this is not a document
20	in dispute, correct?
21	MR. SCHAEFFER: I don't believe.
22	Ms. McGivern corrects me. It's 300.

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: It's 300?
2	MR. SCHAEFFER: ASCAP 300. It's page 17
3	from ASCAP 300.
4	MR. RICH: Give us a moment.
5	MR. SCHAEFFER: Sure.
6	MS. McGIVERN: It's the Corporation for
7	Public Broadcasting's annual report for 1996. Oh, I'm
8	sorry, it's 302.
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Is that the whole
10	thing?
11	We don't need this then?
12	MR. SCHAEFFER: Well, it just makes it
13	easier to read.
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Oh, okay.
15	MR. SCHAEFFER: That's the reason we did
16	it. It's hard to read the other one.
17	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
18	Q Mr. Downey, would you agree from that
19	chart that the trend since 1975 overwhelmingly is that
20	private funding is becoming increasingly important in
21	relative terms to the funding of public broadcasting?
22	A Increasingly in contrast to Federal, or

1	are you just saying
2	Q In contrast to all governmental, including
3	Federal.
4	Isn't that pretty clear?
5	A Well, the proportion the mix has
6	changed. Obviously the number has increased over
7	those what, 20 some odd 20 years.
8	Q Yeah.
9	A And the proportion appears by this graph
LO	to have become more you know, more weighted towards
Ll	private than tax-based or Federal, whatever the
L2	contrast is.
L3	Q Now there are two ways, are there not,
L4	over the next five years, that public television and
L5	public broadcasting generally will achieve much of, if
L6	not all, of their private funding. One is pledge
L7	drives, and secondly is from underwriters, correct?
L8	That would be the overwhelming way of
L9	collecting private funds?
20	A Private funds?
21	Q Yes.
22	A Yes, over yes, the corporate and

1	membership.
2	Q All right. I'm going to ask you to take
3	a look at an article which appeared in <i>The Boston</i>
4	Herald on December 1, 1997 and to distribute that
5	among the counsel and the Panel.
6	(Whereupon, the above-mentioned
7	document was marked as ASCAP
8	Exhibit 10X for
9	identification.)
10	MR. RICH: I'm sorry, was this marked?
11	JUDGE GULIN: It's already in evidence.
12	MR. SCHAEFFER: It's already in. I just
13	made a photo we just made a color copy so you could
14	see it.
15	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: This is
16	MR. SCHAEFFER: 10X.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: 10X?
18	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
19	Q Now if you'd just take a look at those two
20	pages, I have some questions to ask you about them.
21	Would you agree with Ms. McCarthy, as she
22	states in the second paragraph, that the purpose of

1	the pledge program is to create an atmosphere for
2	people to support the station or be happy they're
3	already supporting the station?
4	A Yes.
5	Q You used to work with WGBH many years ago,
6	I take it?
7	A I did.
8	Q And WGBH is one of the big four, so to
9	speak, of producing stations?
LO	A Yes.
L1	Q Would you also agree that "many of the
L2	specials aired during these times are intended to
L3	connect with people on an emotional level,"
L4	according to Mr. Bachman that was. Would you agree
L5	with his statement?
L6	A Yes, but it's not to suggest that programs
L7	at other times of year aren't intended to.
L8	Q Okay, that's a fair comment.
L9	Then he goes on to say, "Other programs
20	are special events meant to make the viewer feel
21	connected to the station," and I assume you would
22	agree with that as well?

1	A Yes.
2	Q The article goes on to say that "pledge
3	specials come from several sources," which I take it
4	is true?
5	A Yes.
6	Q And according to Mr. Bachman, "PBS has a
7	department geared toward commissioning and acquiring
8	such shows for fund raising." Is that true?
9	A That is true.
10	Q What is the name of that department?
11	A The name of the undertaking is the Station
12	Independence Program, the objective being to allow
13	stations to find sources of private money which will
14	make them independent, and we most commonly use the
15	acronym SIP, S-I-P.
16	Q Now Mr. Bachman says that that department
17	is geared toward commissioning and acquiring such
18	funds such shows for fund raising. I'm not clear
19	what he means, but is there some effort by the SIP
20	program, if that's what it is, toward getting shows
21	that will be particularly appropriate for fund
22	raising?

1	A That's what it does is find
2	Q And how does it do that?
3	A It has a small staff that either
4	commissions or acquires programs which it feels will
5	be, you know, regarded as successful.
6	Q So it actually, in effect, buys the rights
7	to individual programs which it thinks are
8	particularly appropriate for pledge week or whatever,
9	is that
10	A Yes.
11	Q That's my understanding.
12	Are SIP programs on the PBS feed?
13	A Yes, they're fed by PBS.
14	Q Okay. Now he also mentions here the
15	American Program Service also provides such shows.
16	What is the American Program Service?
17	A It is a separate it is a program
18	distributor based on Boston that is independent of PBS
19	but is whose client base is all public television
20	stations.
21	Q And to your knowledge, do they also
22	provide certain kinds of program especially for fund

1	raising or pledging or that kind of thing?
2	A Yes.
3	Q Then the article goes on to say, "The mix
4	of regular series, concerts, nostalgic specials and in
5	studio events are geared" again "to entertain and
6	inform viewers. But the bottom line really is public
7	television's bottom line."
8	"All money collected in December" this
9	is the WGBH "will go to the station's new program
LO	fund."
L1	Is that a fair characterization of the
L2	programs that are acquired by SIP and sort of destined
L3	to be pledge week drives?
L4	MR. RICH: We're focusing on the first of
L5	the two sentences you read?
L6	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes, I am.
7	MR. RICH: Thank you.
L8	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, which is the
L9	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
20	Q "Mix of regular series, concerts,
21	nostalgic specials and in studio events are geared to
22	entertain and inform viewers."

1	I'm asking if those kinds of shows are
2	particularly appropriate for pledge week or that sort
3	of fund raising?
4	A Well, I agree with that first sentence, if
5	that's the question.
6	Q Okay, that's satisfactory to me.
7	Now isn't it a fact that certain specials
8	have been unusually successful for public television
9	stations in the last few years?
10	A As with anything in life, some endeavors
11	are more successful than others and yes.
12	Q Now I'm going to ask you about several.
13	Hasn't Riverdance been one of the really most
14	important pledge specials that the public television
15	stations have carried?
16	A Yes, it was a very successful program.
17	Q And it's repeatedly carried, isn't it?
18	A It was repeatedly carried in I think
19	the rights have since expired, but it was extensively
20	carried while its rights were
21	Q During what years approximately?
22	A Gosh, I think it was

1	Q	Last year?
2	A	A year ago March I think was when
3	Riverdance	came on.
4	Q	And Riverdance is I don't know that
5	everybody's	seen Riverdance.
6		Have you seen Riverdance?
7	A	I have.
8	Q	Would you tell us just briefly what it is?
9	A	It's a stage presentation of Irish dancing
10	and folk mu	sic, and that's essentially the
11	Q	There was also I'm sorry.
12		There was also Lord of the Dance. That
13	was fairly s	successful too; maybe not as successful as
14	Riverdance?	
15	A	That is correct.
16	Q	And that's a similar kind of program?
17	A	I haven't seen that one, but I believe
18	it's simila	r, yes.
19	Q	Now what about a show called Les Mis; was
20	that succes	sful?
21	A	Yes.
22	Q	In fact, wasn't that one of the most

1	successful fund raisers ever broadcast by the public
2	television industry?
3	A It was successful. I hesitate to say
4	whether it was the most or second most because I'm not
5	certain.
6	Q But it was in that dimension, first or
7	second or third?
8	A It was very successful.
9	Q What years was that shown?
10	A I believe that was two years ago in March,
11	but I'm not certain.
12	Q That's obviously a music content show.
13	It's based on the famous musical?
14	A Yes.
15	Q What about The Three Tenors; was that a
16	big fund raiser for the public television shows?
17	A That was very successful as a fund raiser,
18	yes.
19	Q That was also musical in content, wasn't
20	it?
21	A It was.
22	Q And then there was somebody that Mr. Day

1	said he didn't know who it was, Yanni.
2	A Yes.
3	Q Who is Yanni?
4	A Yanni is a composer/conductor of I believe
5	what's called New Wave music.
6	Q Now
7	A New Age, sorry.
8	Q And he has been successful I'll get to
9	him in a second as a fund raiser?
10	A Yes.
11	Q <u>Current</u> , on August 14th, 1997, said and
12	I'm not going to bother everybody with this if you
13	agree the biggest pledge acts of the 1990's were
14	The Three Tenors, Yanni, Les Misèrables and
15	Riverdance.
16	Would you dispute that?
17	A I wouldn't dispute that.
18	Q And it also said, "Public TV viewers went
19	gonzo over Riverdance when the show debut'd last
20	December, 1996, generating an estimated \$11.5 million
21	dollars in pledges during the last fiscal year.
22	That's about 48 times what it cost to acquire the

1	broadcast rights."
2	Would you dispute that?
3	A I don't have independent knowledge that
4	that's true, but neither would I dispute it. It's
5	probably
6	MR. SCHAEFFER: I think maybe we better
7	mark this because there's some people from PBS
8	would you put before the Arbitrators, with their
9	permission, Exhibit 519.9 and 10, which is an article
10	in <u>Current</u> of August 14, 1997? Make it 11X, yes.
11	(Whereupon, the above-mentioned
12	document was marked as ASCAP
13	Exhibit 11X for
14	identification.)
15	MR. RICH: Might this be a suitable moment
1.6	for a mid afternoon break, Your Honors?
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right,
18	certainly.
19	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
20	the record at 3:42 p.m. and went back on
21	the record at 3:57 p.m.)
22	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:

1	Q Before we get to 11X, a couple of
2	questions I did have. In conducting pledge drives,
3	the local Public Television stations pick themselves
4	the programs, do they not, that they put onto the
5	pledge drives? That isn't done for them by PBS?
6	A PBS supplies programs, but the stations
7	are free to use or not use these
8	Q Now, are any or all of the pledge drive
9	programs produced by PBS?
10	A Are they produced by PBS?
11	Q Yes or bought by PBS for distribution, I
12	should say.
13	A As I said earlier, PBS doesn't produce
14	programs, but we do commission them or acquire them.
15	Q But there were also programs that are
16	sold, produced by other local television stations or
17	other sources of supply that become the basis for
18	pledge programs. Is that correct?
19	A That is correct.
20	Q Now, when we say that PBS acquires
21	programs for pledge drives, would that be part of what
22	I think we previously described as the national feed

1	or the national program service or have I got that
2	confused?
3	A A little confused.
4	Q Okay. Why don't you tell me?
5	A That department at PBS that acquires
6	pledge programming is this SIP, or Station
7	Independence Program, Department. It acquires the
8	programs, turns them over, if you will, to the
9	Scheduling Department, who arranges for the
10	distribution of those programs to stations for their
11	use at times of their choosing.
12	Q Now let's go back to and we'll try and
13	do this fairly quickly because the hour is getting
14	late. You have in front of you ASCAP
15	Cross-Examination Exhibit 11. Do you know a gentleman
16	by the name of Abbott, John Abbott?
17	A First, is this the
18	Q Yes, the one with the sort of German
19	soldier on it, female soldier on it.
20	A If you say so.
21	Q That's what she seems like to me. I don't
22	know.
	1

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: It doesn't look
2	like that to me.
3	(Laughter.)
4	MR. SCHAEFFER: Have you seen Cabaret?
5	THE WITNESS: I do know John Abbott.
6	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
7	Q And who is he?
8	A John is the Senior Vice President of
9	Development for PBS.
10	Q And he is quoted in this issue of Current
11	as saying, "Programs like Riverdance and Les
12	Miserables not only work wonders in recruiting new
13	members and bringing contributions from continuing
14	members. They also reaffirm for viewers why they
15	support Public TV." Do you think that's a fair
16	statement?
17	A Yes.
18	MR. SCHAEFFER: All right. I'm not going
19	to offer that in evidence.
20	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
21	Q I'm next going to put in front of you
22	well, let me see if I can

1	MR. SCHAEFFER: Would you put in front of
2	the witness a document from Public Broadcasting Report
3	dated March 21st, 1997? It's 712.15 and 16.
4	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: That would be
5	March's ASCAP Exhibit 12X.
6	(Whereupon, the aforementioned
7	document was marked for
8	identification as ASCAP
9	Cross-Examination Ehibit Number
10	12X.)
11	JUDGE GULIN: This is a document in
12	dispute?
13	MR. SCHAEFFER: I believe so, yes.
14	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
15	Q Would you read that to yourself for a
16	moment?
17	A (Perusing document.)
18	Q It is a fact, is it not, that PBS keeps
19	track of the total pledge results for the local
20	stations and releases that information from time to
21	time?
22	A Yes.

	How is that information gathered up?
2	A To the best of my it's not my
3	department. So I'm to the best of my knowledge,
4	stations are asked to we have a system-wide
5	communication system called PBS Express. And they're
6	asked to send us e-mails on PBS Express of their
7	results on a daily basis. Then those are tabulated.
8	Q And from time to time, I take it somebody
9	at PBS in Alexandria announces to the public what the
10	results of particular drives have been?
11	A Yes.
12	Q And are drives generally conducted certain
13	times of the year?
14	A Yes.
15	Q When are the drives conducted?
16	A March, August, and December.
17	Q Now, the first line of this article says,
18	"Public Broadcasters face daunting prospect of topping
19	last year's first ever \$50 million pledge drive, but
20	early numbers suggest that they just succeed."
21	In March of 1997, how close to the \$50
22	million did the Public Television stations come to?

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1	A I don't know.
2	Q Would there be records of PBS to that
3	effect?
4	A Yes.
5	Q Do you know just generally if it was close
6	to that, maybe not more, maybe not less, but within
7	that ballpark in '97?
8	A I really I honestly don't know. I
9	assume it was relatively close because if it had been
10	wildly greater or wildly below, I think I would have
11	heard about it, but
12	Q You would have heard about it because you
13	would have been short money.
14	A Well, these funds don't come to PBS.
15	These are raised individually by stations.
16	Q But you would have heard from the local
17	stations that they were short money. Is that correct?
18	A That's a reasonable assumption.
19	Q And a number of programs are mentioned in
20	this. I'm just curious which one of them, if any
21	a number of programs are mentioned in here. And I
22	just wanted to ask you a question or two to see if you

13	would have l	oeen short money.
14	A	Well, these funds don't come to PBS.
15	These are ra	aised individually by stations.
16	Q	But you would have heard from the local
17	stations tha	at they were short money. Is that correct?
18	A	That's a reasonable assumption.
19	Q	And a number of programs are mentioned in
20	this. I'm	just curious which one of them, if any
21	a number of	programs are mentioned in here. And I
22	just wanted	to ask you a question or two to see if you

NEAL R. GROSS

1	know what the source of those programs was.
2	For example, there's reference here to Les
3	Mis, which I take it was a real record-setter in
4	pledge drives?
5	A It was a very successful pledge program.
6	Q And was that a PBS-acquired show?
7	A It was commissioned by PBS through WNET
8	and was actually part of the Great Performances
9	series.
10	Q I see. You have here a reference to
11	Evening With Harry Belafonte and Friends. Was that a
12	PBS-acquired show?
13	A Well, you say I "have a reference." This
14	is
15	Q I'm sorry. I mean the article refers to.
16	A Okay. Harry Belafonte was acquired by
17	PBS.
18	Q That was essentially a music show, I
19	assume?
20	A Yes.

7.75Y

1	show. Was that acquired by PBS for the local
2	stations?
3	A Yes.
4	Q Do you have any recollection of what it
5	costs to acquire Les Mis in Concert for
6	A No.
7	Q Do you have any recollection about the
8	other programs: Harry Belafonte and Friends or Lord
9	of the Dance?
10	A I'm guessing it would be I would guess
11	somewhere in the range of 100 to 200 thousand.
12	Q Do you have any recollection, say, for
13	Harry Belafonte of how much that yielded in pledges
14	for the local television stations?
15	A I don't know.
16	Q Those numbers would be somewhere at PBS,
17	though, I assume?
18	A Again, we do collect the numbers. One
19	thing you have to be cautious of is the inference that
20	because somebody pledged at the end of that program,
21	that was the reason they pledged. They may be
22	pledging for other reasons as well.

1	Q Right.
2	A We do collect
3	Q But that was the occasion that was used?
4	A That's the occasion at which the pledge
5	occurred. This was pointed out by Abbott in that
6	earlier quote you read that it reminds people why they
7	like Public Television. And that may stimulate a
8	pledge. It has nothing to do with the program
9	necessarily.
10	MR. SCHAEFFER: Now, next I ask that what
11	was Exhibit 505.32 be marked as ASCAP's next
12	cross-examination exhibit, 13X.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: It will be marked as
14	Exhibit 13X.
15	(Whereupon, the aforementioned
16	document was marked for
17	identification as ASCAP
18	Cross-Examination Exhibit
19	Number 13X.)
20	MR. SCHAEFFER: Thank you.
21	JUDGE GULIN: And, to be clear, 12X
22	remains in evidence?

1	MR. SHORE: 12X was in
2	JUDGE GULIN: Remains in evidence. You're
3	not asking us to rule on the motion to strike at this
4	point?
5	MR. SCHAEFFER: That's right.
6	MR. SHORE: Correct.
7	MR. SCHAEFFER: Most of these I'm not
8	going beyond. This is really to refresh him with.
9	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
10	Q Would you read 505.32, which is I guess 12
11	or 13, the document in front of you?
12	A (Perusing document.) All right.
13	Q In this article, Mr. Scalem, whom I think
14	you previously identified as the Vice President of
15	Fund-Raising or if not, I assume he is the Vice
16	President of Fund-Raising of PBS or was
17	A Or was.
18	Q Was he that in 1997?
19	A Yes.
20	Q And apparently he said that the
21	withdrawn.
22	Do you have any reason to dispute that

1	\$30.5 had been raised during December 1996 by pledge
2	drives by Public Television?
3	A No.
4	Q Nor would you dispute Mr. Scalem's quoted
5	statement that "This is one of the largest increases
6	from one pledge period to another, from one year to
7	another that I've ever seen."
8	And he credited the lineup of
9	top-performing shows, which included Riverdance, Andre
10	Reiu, The Vienna I Love, and the American Master
11	Special: Danny Kaye, A Legacy of Laughter?
12	A Jim is a colleague of mine, but I do have
13	to point out this is a little self-serving.
14	Q Why do you say it's self-serving?
15	A Well, because Jim is the one who acquires
16	the programs.
17	Q I see.
18	A So while I don't dispute that, it is
19	natural for PBS to want to make sure that its stations
20	give PBS the credit for having done a splendid job.
21	And I believe we did so, but I feel compelled to just
22	point that out.

1	Q I see. Well, you're not suggesting Mr.
2	Scalem would have gilded the lily or said something
3	that was not true?
4	A I certainly don't think he would have said
5	something that is not true.
6	Q Do you know what Andre Reiu, The Vienna I
7	Love, what kind of show that was?
8	A No. I'm sorry. I don't.
9	Q Did you ever see the Danny Kaye show?
10	A I did not.
11	Q I'm just going to move on to another
12	subject, but let me ask you something: Of the
13	existence of any of these pledge drives or the use of
14	music in these pledge drives mentioned anywhere in
15	your direct testimony?
16	A I don't believe so.
17	Q And so that was left out by you when you
18	testified?
19	A Yes.
20	Q "Yes" or "No"?
21	You have testified that Public
22	Television's programming expenditures have been held

1	in check. "In a challenging economic environment in
2	which we are requiring our program producers to hold
3	the line on expenses, it ill-behooves the performing
4	rights organizations to seek significant fee increases
5	for one set of contributions to such programming."
6	Did you write that?
7	A I think I my testimony was a
8	combination of things I wrote and things that were
9	suggested and that I reviewed and edited. So I can't
10	tell you exactly whether I parsed that particular
11	sentence or not, but it is my testimony.
12	Q So it may not have been written by you?
13	It may have been written for you?
14	A It may have been.
15	Q Now, tell me about the process by which
16	your direct testimony was created. How did that work?
17	Without telling me the communications between you and
18	counsel, just what happened?
19	A Well, we met. I met with counsel. We
20	discussed the case and the issues. I made suggestions
21	about things I thought would, you know, advance our
22	point of view.

1	Counsel assisted in the drafting of
2	testimony. I then reviewed it, edited it, moved some
3	things around. Through an iterative process, we came
4	up with the testimony that was eventually submitted.
5	Q How much time did you personally spend in
6	this process?
7	A Probably I'll say maybe 40 hours a week.
8	Q And I noticed that your testimony and Mr.
9	Jabelow's have a very similar organizational
10	structure. Both of them start off with the word
11	"Introduction," untitled.
12	The first section of yours is described at
13	Page 3, "An Overview of Public Television and its
14	Operations." Mr. Jabelow, who is on radio, of course,
15	says, "An Overview of Public Radio and its
16	Operations."
17	The subsection, then, on yours is "One
18	Mission of Public Television," Page 4. Mr. Jabelow's
19	is "Public Radio's Mission." You then have a title,
20	"PBS' Role in the Operation of Public Television."
21	Jabelow has "NPR's Role in the Operations of Public
22	Radio."

1	You have "The Trends in Public
2	Television's Broadcasting Operations." He has "Trends
3	in Public Radio Programming." And he has another one
4	that's not comparable.
5	Can you account for this similarity?
6	A It seems like a logical structure, beyond
7	that, I can't help you, no.
8	Q Isn't it a fact that those captions were
9	put on the document for you?
10	A Yes.
11	MR. SCHAEFFER: Would you put before the
12	witness and the Panel Public Broadcasting's 1997
13	annual report? We've also got a color copy of one
14	page, which is very hard to read. It's Page 2.
15	And this would be 14X. And I will offer
16	this in evidence if it's not in already.
17	(Whereupon, the aforementioned
18	document was marked for
19	identification as ASCAP
20	Cross-Examination Exhibit
21	Number 14X.)
22	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:

1	Q Have you ever seen this document before,
2	Mr. Downey?
3	A Yes.
4	Q What is it?
5	A It's a PBS annual report.
6	Q I'm going to turn your attention to Page
7	11 of that report.
8	A Uh-huh.
9	Q And I'm going to direct your attention to
10	the next to the last paragraph on that page, where it
11	says "Last year." I assume that's 1996?
12	A Yes.
13	Q "PBS promised to strengthen the
14	centerpiece national program service, specifically to
15	increase its budget 50 percent by the year 2000
16	without significant increases in dues from member
17	
l	stations. In the first year of PBS's station equity
18	stations. In the first year of PBS's station equity model for program financing, investment in national
18 19	
	model for program financing, investment in national
19	model for program financing, investment in national programming increased by 16 percent, or \$18 million."

to the second page of the document and ask you if the following, which appears in the final report, is true under "Financial Highlights." "The Public Broadcasting Service, PBS, is developing new revenue opportunities to generate earnings to enhance its member services and to relieve local financial pressures.

"PBS' services include a unique array of noncommercial programming and related resources delivered via the PBS-managed satellite system and the internet as well as preschool to postgraduate education services, the school, college library, and at-home use.

"Fiscal Year 1997 operating revenue was up by almost \$32 million over Fiscal Year 1996, due largely to growth in PBS' learning venture activities, such as PBS' The Business Channel, PBS' home video, and the PBS' adult learning service.

"In addition, strategic media partners' direct investment in programming added another \$15 million, for a total increase of \$47 million, or 23 percent. The net effect was an increase in

NEAL R. GROSS

1	investments in future programming of \$18 million, a 16
2	percent rise.
3	"Moreover, operating earnings were strong,
4	despite the mid-year loss of Telstar 401, the
5	satellite used to transmit PBS' programming to
6	membership."
7	Is that true?
8	A Uh-huh, yes.
9	MR. SCHAEFFER: I next ask that there be
10	put before the witness a document which appeared on
11	the PBS
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Let me interrupt
13	you just a moment. You moved this into evidence?
14	MR. SCHAEFFER: I move that in evidence.
15	I'm sorry. Go ahead.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Any objection?
17	MR. RICH: No objection.
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. It will
19	be received without objection.
20	(Whereupon, the aforementioned
21	document, having previously
22	been marked for identification

1	as ASCAP Cross-Examination
2	Exhibit Number 14X, was
3	received in evidence.)
4	MR. SCHAEFFER: I next ask that a January
5	28th, 1998 be marked as 15X. And I will, Mr. Rich, be
6	offering this into evidence.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: It will be marked as
8	Exhibit 15X.
9	(Whereupon, the aforementioned
10	document was marked for
11	identification as ASCAP
12	Cross-Examination Exhibit
13	Number 15X.)
14	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right?
15	MR. SCHAEFFER: Have you finished reading
16	it, everybody? I don't know. They haven't seen it
17	before.
18	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
19	Q Have you ever seen this before?
20	A No.
21	Q I will for the Panel's benefit say we got
22	this from the PBS Web site. Let me ask you a few

1	questions before I offer it in evidence. The headline
2	reads, "PBS Revenue Grows 20 Percent in Fiscal 1997,
3	PBS President Ervin Duggan Tells Annual Fall Planning
4	Meeting of Station Executives."
5	Is that true?
6	A I'll take it at face value. I don't
7	Q Were you at that meeting?
8	A I was at that meeting, yes.
9	Q Do you recall Mr. Duggan saying that there
LO	had been a very successful 1997 for PBS?
11	A There was a successful '97. I'm sorry.
12	I can't tell you of my own present knowledge that I
L3	recall him mentioning this or not mentioning this.
L4	I'm not disputing it. I just you asked me if I
L5	recalled, and the answer is
16	Q Of your own knowledge, isn't it true that
17	in 1997, PBS' revenue went up 20 percent?
18	A If that's what this
19	Q That was 1996 that you're holding.
20	A No. I believe this is '97.
21	Q Oh, it is? Okay. Well, then
22	A The revenues certainly have gone up. And

1	I'll yes, probably about 20 percent.
2	Q And would you agree with the first
3	paragraph of this document that entrepreneurial
4	initiatives and alliances with media partners
5	contributed to a 20 percent jump?
6	A Well, they contributed, yes.
7	Q Would you just explain to us what the
8	entrepreneurial initiatives are that are described?
9	A Well, for example, contributing to this
10	increase were things like PBS home video, where we
11	acquire the rights to the home video rights to PBS
12	programs and then make them available as in-home video
13	and sell them at retail or through direct marketing
14	techniques.
15	And that contributes considerable revenue.
16	It also contributes considerable expense, but it
17	certainly has increased our revenues.
18	Q And I think what you've already testified,
19	that which appears in the third paragraph, mainly that
20	Fiscal 1997 was the first year of the four-year PBS
21	pledge to increase its core national program service
22	budget by 50 percent to 165 million in Fiscal Year

2	A That's the objective, but that's different
3	from revenues. That's to increase the programming
4	budget. And these revenue figures are talking about
5	the entirety of the corporation, not just the national
6	program service.
7	Q And is this, as far as you know, Mr.
8	Duggan's opinion that "Fiscal 1997 was the year when
9	PBS and its member stations made real progress with
10	our strategy of growth. We are changing the economics
11	of Public Television with a whole new range of
12	services PBS stations provide to the American people"?
13	A There's a time and place for a certain
14	level of hyperbole. And I think this is one of those
15	when you're presenting an annual report to your
16	members.
17	Q You think this was hyperbole?
18	A I think he was trying to make the best
19	case he could for the achievements we accomplished.
20	Q Okay. Do you think it was hyperbole to
21	refer to as a banner year, as in the next paragraph?
22	A I'm willing to accept that there

2000 is correct?

eurial 1996, tation
1996,
tation
tation
ces of
unding
se the
amount
ets in
ion in
budget
on to
but
It's
S has

1	rights or rights to the particular programs that
2	they're acquiring?
3	A It was our practice historically to obtain
4	only the broadcast rights. And it is as time has
5	changed, it has been our we have attempted to
6	acquire more than just the broadcast rights because
7	PBS distributes in more than just the broadcast media.
8	We obtain, as I said a moment, home video
9	rights, for example, or
10	Q And then you sell them; right? You sell
11	the videos?
12	A We sell the videos; right.
13	Q And this is all part of an effort to make
14	PBS and, indeed, Public Broadcasting more
15	entrepreneurial, more able to stand on its own two
16	feet; isn't that correct, without government help or
L7	with a minimum of government help?
18	A As I said a moment ago, in part, this was
19	in large part, this was to stop asking the stations
20	to continue to increase their support of PBS. It was
21	a way of providing them with more programming without
22	tasking them with larger assessments.

1	Q And it was also a way, was it not, in
2	response to Congress' concern that PBS wasn't doing
3	enough for itself and that it should be more
4	entrepreneurial. Isn't that true?
5	A That's true.
6	MR. SCHAEFFER: Would you put before the
7	witness okay; we'll do it this way put before
8	the witness what was 515.6, which will be the next
9	ASCAP cross-examination.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: This will be
11	Exhibit 16X?
12	MR. SCHAEFFER: That is correct.
13	(Whereupon, the aforementioned
14	document was marked for
15	identification as ASCAP
16	Cross-Examination Exhibit
17	Number 16X.)
18	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
19	Q Would you read that to yourself?
20	A (Perusing document.)
21	Q Mr. Downey, let me know when you're
22	through.

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
2	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes.
3	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
4	Q This is an article, is it not, by somebody
5	named Steve Behrens in Current. Do you recognize it?
6	A Yes.
7	Q Do you know Steve Behrens?
8	A I do.
9	Q I'm just going to ask you a couple of
10	questions about this. At the last line, it says,
11	"And, as projected, PBS has added \$52 million to its
12	program spending this fiscal year without big
13	increases in station dues and despite lost revenues
14	from Telstar satellite failure."
15	Is that the same number that I previously
16	described as 16 percent, that 52 million, or is it
17	more?
18	A I don't know where this 52 million is
19	coming from or what it includes. It's much larger
20	than the amount by which the national program service
21	programming budget increased.
22	And so I suspect somehow it's gotten

	Steve has gotten mixed up as between revenues and
2	where they're applied, but I can't help you with this
3	figure. I'm sorry.
4	Q Okay. It's unrecognizable to you?
5	A I don't recognize it.
6	Q Now, the beginning of this article starts
7	let's see if Behrens got this right "PBS is
8	giving high priority to four initiatives in coming
9	months, aiming to boost revenue from program rights
10	investments, start new satellite feeds for DTV, and
11	launch new educational products and services that
12	supplement TV, according to the network president,
13	Ervin Duggan."
14	Is that correct?
15	A That sounds about right.
16	Q So that many of these projects that you
17	were previously discussing under direct examination
18	from Mr. Rich were projects that were increasing the
19	revenue of the PBS. Isn't that correct?
20	A Yes.
21	Q Then it goes on to say, "Consolidating
22	gains from the station equity model, this week's
- 1	

1	meeting in Dallas, Duggan plans to announce big
2	increases in ancillary revenues from videocassettes
3	and toy sales as well as PBS' acquisitions of video
4	rights. Buying more rights from producers is
5	fulfilling the promise of the station equity model,
6	making stations investors, rather than renters of
7	programming."
8	And that is one of the major changes now
9	in PBS, isn't it? It is now an investor in program,
10	not just a renter, or is Mr. Duggan wrong?
11	A Well, Mr. Duggan is always right. Mr.
12	Behrens has got this a little garbled.
13	Q Okay.
14	A PBS pays license fees to producers for
15	programs. We have always done that. Going back not
16	very far, we typically had the license fee had to
17	basically equal the cost to produce the program
18	because there was nowhere else to no other way to
19	acquire it.
20	But historically, even though PBS did
21	that, the member stations who put up the money did not
22	get what I would call a fair return on their

1 investment because the program ended up being the 2 property of the producer, who could go off and market 3 it or sell it to some third party and keep the 4 revenues. 5 Now, as long as that was all in the Public 6 Television family, one could argue that it didn't 7 matter. But, as our system needs to become larger, 8 more complicated, as commercial for-profit producers 9 have become involved, we have had to change the relationship. 10 11 Secondly, as stations have had less money 12 to make available to PBS to acquire programs, we've 13 had to find new sources of revenue with which to 14 produce those programs. 15 And so we have changed the relationship 16 and have come to call the funds we put into programs 17 investments so as to make the point that we expect a 18 return on that investment beyond simply the right to 19 show the program on the air. 20 We might expect an income share from 21 whatever benefits flow from the producing of that

For example, we now receive income from the

program.

sale of toys and dolls stimulated by the television 1 program Barney or from Sesame Street. Some of that 2 3 revenue comes back to PBS. 4 If a program is sold overseas, we may be 5 the party selling it. And we may take a distribution fee or somebody else may sell it and we'll get an 6 7 income share. But the point of all of this is to put our 8 9 financial relationships with producers on a more 10 businesslike setting, businesslike footing. In 11 addition, the station equity model also is not so much 12 a difference in kind as degree. It's finding media 13 partners in whom we can -- with whom we can share the 14 cost of producing programs. We may exploit it in 15 certain markets, and the media partner may exploit it in certain other markets. And so that's what this has 16 been all about. 17 18 0 Who of these other media are some 19 partners? Well, for example, we have an agreement 20 Α 21 with the Readers Digest Association, for example, for

the production of programs. And under the terms of

1	that agreement, Readers RDA, Readers Digest, will
2	put up the funding to produce the program.
3	The program is then given to PBS. PBS has
4	the right to distribute it on Public Television. And
5	we end up with domestic home video rights, but the
6	Readers Digest has certain domestic direct response
7	video rights, certain foreign broadcast rights. They
8	would have the right to publish underlying books,
9	books by the author of the program, what have you.
LO	So between us and recognizing we each have
L1	different strengths and weaknesses, we try to get the
L2	best return on the investment of their funds in the
L3	program.
L4	Q You have similar arrangements with Disney,
L5	don't you?
L6	A No. The arrangement we have a relation
L7	with Disney for one program: Bill Nye, the Science
L8	Guy.
L9	Q And what's that relationship?
20	A The program is owned by Disney. It's
21	distributed. It's broadcast on commercial stations on
22	the weekends and by Public TV stations during the week

1	if I'm not mistaken. The program is owned by Disney,
2	but we have no other
3	Q How about Time-Warner? Don't you have
4	some strategic partnerships with Time-Warner?
5	A We have a home video relationship with
6	Warner Home Video. And we have a separate
7	relationship with Warner Brothers Records.
8	Q What's that relationship?
9	A Which, the records?
10	Q Yes. We'll start with the records.
11	A We have an agreement with Warner Brothers
12	Records wherein they put up the cost to produce a
13	program and the cost to make a CD companion or sound
14	track recording.
15	PBS gets the rights to the program,
16	including the home video rights. Warner gets the
17	rights to the CD. To the extent that through the
18	sales of records, the Warner is able to recover its
19	initial investment, then PBS and Warner split whatever
20	additional revenues are earned.
21	Q And, incidentally, as Mr. Behrens maybe
22	got it wrong or not, Mr. Behrens in this article

1	refers to foreign sales. What foreign sales does the
2	station equity model entail?
3	A At this stage, PBS would like at some
4	point in the future to expand its service
5	internationally. That has not been achieved to date.
6	And so the answer to the question is that we receive
7	an income share from foreign PBS has always
8	received income shares from foreign sales.
9	But, again, one of our objectives in the
LO	station equity model is to actually undertake the
L1	distribution ourselves.
L2	Q Mr. Behrens goes on in this same article,
L3	and I'd like you to confirm whether it was true or
L4	not. He says, "Public TV were up three percent in
L5	February," presumably 1997, "and five percent in
L6	March, " also presumably 1997, "compared to the
L7	previous year, while commercial network audiences
L8	continued to erode."
L9	Was that true?
20	A I won't dispute the article. I don't know
21	independently of this.
22	Q Well, do you know yourself what it's been

۱ ۱	like in the last many as took I
1	like in the last year or two? Have commercial
2	networks gone down, PBS stayed the same or gone up?
3	Do you know?
4	A Certainly over
5	Q On Public Television?
6	A Certainly over the last several years, the
7	network ratings have gone down. PBS' ratings have
8	remained pretty steady or constant.
9	MR. SCHAEFFER: Let me see if I can get
10	this. Would you put the 1997 annual report oh, you
11	did? Well, then let's go back to it.
12	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
13	Q I'd like to take a look at 14X again,
14	which is the annual report for '97. And I'd like to
15	confirm and we're almost through I'm sure you'll be
16	glad to hear with some exception. I just want to
17	confirm and just bring together some of the issues
18	I've raised already.
19	This is a letter in the annual report from
20	Mr. Duggan and Mr. Campbell. Mr. Campbell I take it
21	is the Chairman of the Board?
22	A Yes.

1	JUDGE GULIN: What page are you on?
2	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'm sorry. This is Page
3	it's hard to find the page. It's Page 7? The
4	fifth page in, Page 4 on the left. It reads, "Dear
5	Friend." It should be the third or fourth page in.
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Yes, fourth.
7	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes. Okay.
8	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
9	Q I just want to confirm the truth of some
10	of the things which I'm sure are true, but I just want
11	to confirm them. It says, "Dear Friend of PBS: Two
12	years ago, we," presumably PBS, "launched strategies
13	aimed at creating a new, more entrepreneurial PBS, a
14	modern media enterprise rededicated to advancing
15	education causes during citizenship in America by
16	supporting the work of our member stations."
17	Now, that refreshes your recollection, I
18	assume, that it was in 1995 that the station equity
19	model became a new departure for PBS?
20	A I think it was '96.
21	Q You think it was '96. I'll accept that.
22	Then it goes on to say two paragraphs or

1	the third paragraph down, "In a year when the
2	commercial broadcast networks continued to experience
3	erosion of their audience share to niche programmers
4	on cable, PBS' prime time viewership held firm and
5	steady. Our daytime children's program garnered a
6	double-digit increase."
7	I take it that was true?
8	A Yes.
9	Q Then the next paragraph says, "In a
10	ruthlessly competitive media marketplace, where
11	commercial programs struggled to define a distinctive
12	brand identity by appealing to an ever narrowing slice
13	of the democratic pie, we are finding it possible to
14	succeed by reaching out to every audience segment and
15	extending our creativity into new services and new
16	media. We call it expanding the mind print at PBS."
17	I take it that's true?
18	A Yes.
19	Q Then the next paragraph says, "That
20	expansion comes from a new position of financial
21	strength. At then end of the fiscal year, our

revenues before underwriting and including strategic

22

partnerships showed an increase of 23 percent, topping our \$224 million target by \$23 million. "We can take pride not only in the amount of new income but in the sources from which it came, strategic partnerships and growth in services, such as PBS The Business Channel, or PBS adult learning service, and PBS home video. "Of the total PBS revenue, only 52 percent came from station sources, down from 61 percent in 1996. This means that our member stations are getting more for their money, as are the viewers they serve." Then it goes on to say, "In our core programming mission, PBS its met target expanding investment and the national program service 50 percent by the year 2000 and did so without significantly higher programming assessments on our member stations. One result was a programming station that garnered more Peabody awards and children's daytime Emmies than NBC, CBS, ABC, and Fox combined. "And in a year when the broadcast news became struggling the to meet new

Communications Commission requirement of airing a mere

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Federal

1	three hours per week of education or informational
2	children's programming, PBS delivered seven and a half
3	hours of acclaimed curriculum-based educational
4	program weekly."
5	That's all true, isn't it?
6	A Yes.
7	Q Finally, I'm trying to summarize what I
8	believe are accomplishments of which PBS is proudest.
9	And I'm going to ask you whether or not these are
10	true.
11	"In 1996, PBS management implemented a new
12	strategic plan deigned to maximize entrepreneurial
13	efforts and bring increased resources to the backbone
14	of our enterprise, the national program service.
15	"This plan, called the station equity
16	model, included aggressive goals to achieve a 50
17	percent increase in the programming budget over 4
18	years following 3 years of flat funding.
19	"As a result, PBS' operating revenues at
20	the end of Fiscal '97 had grown by almost \$47 million
21	over Fiscal '96 and \$60 million over Fiscal '95, a 32
22	percent increase in 2 years.

1	"PBS' dramatically improved financial
2	performance was a direct result of these new
3	entrepreneurial initiatives and is unprecedented in
4	the history of PBS."
5	That's true, isn't it?
6	MR. RICH: May we learn, Your Honor, what
7	Mr. Schaeffer is reading from so the witness can have
8	the same benefit?
9	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes. It's a letter to
10	Congress dated February 13th, 1998 from PBS.
11	MR. RICH: Might the witness see it?
12	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'll be glad to let the
13	witness see it, and I'm glad to introduce it in
14	evidence. Let's mark this 17X, and I offer it in
15	evidence 16X. It's a letter from PBS to the
16	Congress. It's 17. Sorry.
17	(Whereupon, the aforementioned
18	document was marked for
19	identification as ASCAP
20	Cross-Examination Exhibit
21	Number 17X.)
22	MR. RICH: We have no objection to this.

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. It will
2	be received without objection.
3	(Whereupon, the aforementioned
4	document, having previously
5	been marked for identification
6	as ASCAP Cross-Examination
7	Exhibit Number 17X, was
8	received in evidence.)
9	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: While the witness
10	is looking that over, Mr. Schaeffer
11	MR. SCHAEFFER: This is my last
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Yes. You asked to
13	introduce Exhibit 15X, did you?
14	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes, and I offer it in
15	evidence.
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Was there any
17	objection to that, Mr. Rich?
18	MR. RICH: No objection.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. It will
20	be received as well.
21	(Whereupon, the aforementioned
22	document, having previously

1	been marked for identification
2	as ASCAP Cross-Examination
3	Exhibit Number 15X, was
4	received in evidence.)
5	MR. SCHAEFFER: I'm reading it anyway. Do
6	you want me to just cite the sections. I would just
7	as soon why don't I go you've got it in front of
8	you, and I've got a couple of questions about the
9	document. We probably can move more quickly.
10	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
11	Q Is it also true that in 1996, as you
12	reported to Congress, PBS management began to
13	revolutionize its business practices with regard to
14	the acquisition of program rights?
15	JUDGE GULIN: Excuse me. Mr. Schaeffer,
16	where are you reading from?
17	MR. SCHAEFFER: Page 2, the bottom
18	paragraph.
19	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Was the first
20	question answered?
21	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes.
22	THE WITNESS: No.

1	MR. SCHAEFFER: No?
2	THE WITNESS: I don't believe it was.
3	MR. SCHAEFFER: Okay. I'm sorry.
4	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
5	Q Then was what I read to you about in the
6	first paragraph correct?
7	A I don't think it is, actually, or at least
8	there's an inferred nexus between the station equity
9	model and these figures of 47 million and 60 million,
10	which may not be quite accurate.
11	My point here is that the station equity
12	model has to do with the national program service.
13	And, really, it is most directly related to the reason
14	we're here today, the programs that our stations
15	broadcast.
16	PBS engages in other activities that have
17	nothing to do with the programs that stations
18	broadcast, which contribute to our revenues and to
19	these numbers you see here; for example, again, home
20	video or things like the adult learning service, which
21	has a non-broadcast component, or things like other
22	kinds of cable or direct broadcast satellite services.

1	Maybe that does bear on your interests.
2	All of these have sort of gotten washed
3	together here.
4	Q This is a letter that was written to
5	Congress to justify the giving of bonuses to certain
6	officers of PBS, including you. Isn't that correct?
7	A Yes, that's correct.
8	Q And are you telling me that some of this
9	is inaccurate?
10	A Well, I think the data are all accurate.
11	I think, however, linking you see the sentence that
12	reads "As a result, PBS' operating revenues at the end
13	of '97 had grown by 47 million over '96 and 60 million
14	over '95."
15	That is a true statement, but I'm a little
16	troubled by linking that narrowly to the station
17	equity model.
18	Q Is this the first time you've ever seen
19	this letter?
20	A No. I've seen this letter before.
21	Q Did you ever point out to anybody that
22	this letter to Congress wasn't accurate or was

1	misleading?
2	A I only focused my attention this minute
3	when you
4	Q Well, let's look at the second paragraph.
5	I'm not going to bother reading it out loud because
6	everybody can read it themselves. Is that inaccurate
7	also?
8	A I haven't read the second one fully.
9	Q Well, why don't you read it?
10	MR. RICH: Which is it? May I ask which
11	the second paragraph
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: You're on Page 2?
13	MR. SCHAEFFER: The second bullet on Page
14	2 now that we found out the first bullet is
15	inaccurate.
16	MR. RICH: Objection.
17	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: The objection is
18	sustained. Stricken from the record.
19	BY MR. SCHAEFFER:
20	Q Is that accurate?
21	A Yes.
22	Q Let me skip now to because the letter is

1	going to be in evidence now and the Arbitrators can
2	read it for themselves and I'm about to conclude the
3	last bullet point on Page 3, "PBS' future is directly
4	tied to its programming vision and the successful
5	execution of that vision.
6	"Our national programming enjoyed
7	extraordinary successes in 1997, during which PBS
8	introduced new and innovative programs. Among these
9	programs were Ken Burn's Thomas Jefferson, TR, The
10	Living End, and Arthur. These and many other programs
11	that were added last year garnered extraordinary
12	critical acclaim and an unusual number of awards."
13	That's all true, isn't it?
14	A Yes.
15	Q Now, all of these were offered to show
16	that the officers of PBS were entitled to an
17	extraordinary bonus in 1997. Isn't that correct?
18	A I think that was the point of this.
19	Q Where did the funds for that bonus come
20	from?
21	A From PBS' general funds.
22	MR. SCHAEFFER: No further questions.

1	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. Thank
2	you.
3	Let me just inquire. Mr. Kleinberg, are
4	you going to have cross-examination?
5	MR. KLEINBERG: Yes, I will.
6	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. Mr.
7	Rich, are you going
8	MR. RICH: I'll have some redirect, I
9	suspect.
10	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Redirect?
11	MR. RICH: It's been a very long day for
12	the witness, too, I believe, at this point.
13	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Tomorrow morning?
14	MR. SCHAEFFER: Fine with us.
15	MR. KLEINBERG: I'm perfectly happy to do
16	that because I feel some break would allow me to
17	condense, rather than to
18	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. 9:30 or
19	10:00?
20	MR. RICH: What's the Panel's purpose?
21	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Which do you all
22	prefer?

1	MR. KLEINBERG: Whatever is convenient for
2	the witness an the Panel.
3	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Downey, which
4	is more convenient for you, sir?
5	THE WITNESS: Actually, 10:00 would be a
6	little easier if that's all right.
7	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right. We'll
8	recess until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning. Mr.
9	Downey, you're excused until 10:00 tomorrow morning.
10	(Whereupon, the witness was temporarily
11	excused.)
12	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
13	the record at 4:58 p.m. and went back on
14	the record at 4:59 p.m.)
15	MR. KLEINBERG: Since this is the first
16	time we have a witness that carries over, I'm
17	inquiring as to what the Panel's practice is with
18	respect to the witness' consultation with counsel
19	while he's still in the middle of cross-examination.
20	My usual understanding in most places is
21	that while still on cross, that consultation should
22	not occur, but I thought I'd raise it since we haven't

-	inad that problem in the course of the proceedings to
2	date.
3	JUDGE GULIN: Well, we haven't had any
4	witnesses carried over.
5	MR. KLEINBERG: That's what I'm saying.
6	JUDGE GULIN: We had breaks, though.
7	MR. SCHAEFFER: I've always I'm sorry.
8	JUDGE GULIN: I have to make inquiry again
9	whether you conferred with your witnesses during the
10	break.
11	MR. SCHAEFFER: I have refrained from
12	doing so and instructed everybody on my team not to do
13	so.
14	MR. KLEINBERG: That's my understanding if
15	I
16	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Do you have any
17	trouble with that, Mr. Rich?
18	MR. RICH: We have followed the same
19	practice.
20	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: All right.
21	MR. RICH: I had not contemplated,
22	however, we have not followed that practice with

1	respect to redirect examination, where counsel has
2	conferred with their clients but
3	MR. SCHAEFFER: Yes. I think that's
4	MR. RICH: And I would ask both Mr.
5	Kleinberg and Mr. Schaeffer I've got probably half
6	a dozen areas from your examination that I might want
7	to speak to this witness about overnight if that's not
8	a problem.
9	MR. KLEINBERG: I don't have any problem
10	with the differentiation between after the cross is
11	completed and the beginning of the redirect.
12	CHAIRPERSON GRIFFITH: Mr. Downey, what
13	we're saying is that you're not to confer with counsel
L4	until the cross-examination of you is completed. And
15	you'll be able to confer with counsel, if necessary,
L6	before the beginning of redirect. Agreed?
17	MR. SCHAEFFER: That's our understanding,
18	Your Honor.
19	MR. KLEINBERG: Thank you, Your Honor.
20	(Whereupon, the foregoing matter was
21	recessed at 5:00 p.m., to be reconvened
22	on Tuesday, March 31, 1998 at 10:00 a.m.)

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing transcript in

the matter of:

Hearing: Adjustment of the Rates for

Noncommercial Educational

Broadcasting Compulsory License,

Docket No. 96-6 CARP NCBRA

Before:

Library of Congress

Copyright Arbitration Royalty Panel

Date:

March 30, 1998

Place:

Washington, DC

represents the full and complete proceedings of the aforementioned matter, as reported and reduced to typewriting.

Mylanday